



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PSYCHOANALYTIC STUDIES OF GENIUS.

By LUCILE DOOLEY, Clark University

The material gathered under this title and published herewith is a collection of epitomes, or abstracts, of essays on the psychology of great men, which have appeared from time to time during the last decade, for the most part in German psychoanalytic periodicals. The purpose in gathering them thus and presenting them in brief has been two-fold; first, to introduce this important branch of psychoanalytical literature to those who do not readily read, or have access to, the German; and, second, to use them as an introduction to a study of genius from the psychoanalytic viewpoint, which the writer is preparing, of which the principal part is an analysis of the character and genius of Charlotte Brontë.

I have not exhausted, in this collection of epitomes, the psychoanalytic studies that refer to well-known men and women. But those remaining are, for the most part, more concerned with pathology than with the character and genius of the individual, or else they explain the motivation of some particular production of the subject, without giving any analysis of the character of the author. Two of those I have given here, indeed, came under this latter category. They are "Jensen's 'Gradiva'" by Sigmund Freud and "Hamlet and the 'Oedipus-Complex'" by Ernest Jones. But these two essays are of fundamental importance as having initiated and stimulated this movement in the study of genius.

The first indication of the possibilities for psychoanalysis in art, literature, and biography, in fact, was found in Freud's "Interpretation of Dreams," which remains as the embryo out of which the whole structure of non-pathological applications of psychoanalysis has grown. Freud gave a definite impulse to this particular new line of psychological analysis when he brought out his beautiful analysis of "Gradiva," following it with his "Leonardo." Ernest Jones took up the hint dropped in the "Interpretation of Dreams" about Hamlet, and elaborated his own admirable study. It has proved a most inviting field, and one in which there still remains much unbroken ground.

I

THE DELUSION AND THE DREAMS IN JENSEN'S "GRADIVA"

By S. FREUD, 1907, *Schriften zur angewandten Seelenkunde*, I, 81 p.

Among those "dreams that never were dreamt" but were attributed by an author to the characters in his tale, few lend themselves more perfectly to the uses of the psycho-analyst than those in the "Gradiva" of Wilhelm Jensen, a little story which he calls a "Pompeian Fantasy." Not only the dreams but the plot of the story might come from an idealized clinical record. The story runs as follows:

A young archeologist, Norbert Hanold, who cares only for his studies, who shuns all social life and seems unaware that women

exist in the world of reality, finds an ancient bit of sculpture, representing a young girl in the posture of walking, which takes a strong hold upon his imagination. "He finds something modern in it," as if the artist had copied it on the street, "from the life." (p. 2.) He calls the maiden "Gradiva," "the one stepping forward," and fancies her the daughter of a patrician aedile of Pompeii, one who took his part in the service of the temple of Ceres (p. 2). He decided that she was undoubtedly Grecian. Gradually he became absorbed in speculation as to the origin of the piece and especially busied with the problem as to whether the artist had rendered it "after the life." To determine this point, so important, as he fancied, to his archeological research, he observed the gait and the feet of women whenever he could, and his failure to find a foot or a graceful gait like the Gradiva's filled him with distress.

Then he had a dream of Pompeii, in which he saw Gradiva "in her native town where she lived at the same time as himself." (p. 3.) He saw her climb the steps of the temple of Jupiter, lie down there, and become white as marble, and then he saw her buried by the rain of ashes. (p. 7.) When he woke he heard the song of a canary in a cage in a window opposite, and, glancing out, he thought he saw the likeness of Gradiva in the street. He hastened down but could not find her. The dissatisfaction thus aroused decided him to escape his cage and go upon a springtime journey to Italy—in the interests of science. (p. 4.) On his journey he was much annoyed by his constant meetings with young couples on their honeymoon. Disgusting and inexplicable as their actions were, however, they aroused in him a feeling of greater dissatisfaction, of "something lacking," which impelled him restlessly ever southward till he came to Pompeii, realizing only then that this had been the goal of his journey all along, and that his purpose was to seek some trace of Gradiva—her foot print in the ashes, perhaps. (p. 10.)

And there, at midday, he saw her as he had seen her in his dream, which he had meanwhile forgotten. For some time he more than half believes her to be a phantom, which lives again only at midday. He offers her asphodel, the "flower of forgetfulness" and awaits her coming daily. Then he sees again one of the young couples, and the rose worn by the lady reminds him of Gradiva's words about roses when he gave her asphodel. He dreams that night that "somewhere in the sun" sat Gradiva, and she made a noose of grass with which to catch a lizard and said: "Please, be quite still—my lady colleague is right, this means is really good, and she has used it with the best results." (p. 18.) He had met an old scientist catching lizards that day. He learns, soon after this, by a gradual revelation from the girl, that she is *Zoë Bertgang*, daughter of a zoologist of his own university town. She had been his childhood's playmate and they had shared their meals together, cuffed, and teased, and loved each other. It is when she speaks of the canary bird in her window that the full memory dawns upon him, to which she has been carefully leading up, like one who cautiously awakens a sleeper from his dream. The story ends, as novels do, in a wedding.

In this story the building up of the fantasy about the little image is traceable to just the causes that a psychiatrist finds for the obsessions of his patients. The memory of the erotic experience of childhood was repressed into the unconscious by the conflicting tendencies developed at puberty. But, repressed, it was not quiescent, it constantly worked for a fulfillment of the childhood wish for the little playmate

with whom his relations had so deliciously alternated between the aggressive and the tender. (p. 35 and 70.) The basrelief, by an unexplained accident, reproduces the characteristic gait of Zoë, which had unconsciously become to him a fetiche. (p. 38.) His resistance is so strong that it creates almost a negative hallucination with regard to the actual object of his childish love, for he knows nothing of her, though she lives just across the street. The passion for study has been the conscious expression of his libido, but the direction of his study has been determined by the unconscious object, i. e., the study of ancient, buried things, comparable to the buried epoch of childhood. The placing of the relief in Pompeii is an expression of the wish to "dig up this buried past." (p. 42.) The delusion that Gradiva has been buried and comes to life expresses his wish, or hope, that she actually live. Herein is the explanation of the "modern" impression conveyed by the figure, while the subconscious memory leads him to dream of their having lived together in Pompeii, the native town of both. The representation of the father as devoted to the service of Ceres has symbolic connection with his profession of zoölogy. The name "Gradiva" is a translation of Bertgang. (p. 30.) (Bert=*glänzende*, gang=*schreiten*, the "glorious gait.") Zoë is a Greek name for *life*. The second dream is more complicated than the first one, but it too shows clear wish-fulfillment. Zoë is identified with her father, the lizard catcher. He himself is the lizard and he would gladly be caught. (p. 62.) The reference to the colleague (the words almost an exact repetition of those that Prof. Bertgang had employed the day before—p. 81) relates to the young bride. "Somewhere in the Sun" signifies the hotel "Albergo di Sole" which he has just discovered after noting, subconsciously, that "Gradiva" was not among the guests of any of the others.

The unconsciously motivated actions of the hero are as significant as the dreams and the fantasy. His journey is a flight from the living love, which he is not prepared to accept, in search of her fantastic substitute. (54-57.) He offers her asphodel, symbolic of forgetfulness. He takes the young bride and groom for sister and brother when they no longer offend him—a new defensive mechanism. He seeks to know what guests are in all the hotels while he still believes Gradiva to be a phantom.

To complete the clinical parallel, Zoë follows the psychoanalytic method of catharsis for his restoration to sane and normal life. She gradually brings the buried memory to consciousness, "digging up something interesting," as she told her friend. (p. 21.) She transfers the deep emotion that weights the repressed memory and its delusional expression to herself, as a physician must do, but, unlike the physician, she does not have to bring about a further transference, and so her cure is completely satisfactory. The buried wish is not only brought to light, but it finds complete and literal fulfillment.

That the poet knew nothing of the psychoanalytic theory and method does not invalidate the conclusions of the study, but rather enhances their value. The story was a product of his fancy, as he says, that is, it is drawn from his own unconscious, and it has a completeness that is not always possible in a study from real life, where some facts are beyond our reach. The poet divines where the physician dissects, and both are interpreters of life. One great argument for the dynamic force of the unconscious is the fact that poets write so much better and larger than they know.

II

A CHILDHOOD MEMORY OF LEONARDO DA VINCI

By SIGMUND FREUD, 1910, *Schriften VII*, 71 p.

To men of his own time, as to those of ours, the character of Leonardo da Vinci, one of the greatest artists and greatest men of the Renaissance, has been an insoluble enigma. Why did he find such difficulty in finishing his later pictures, leaving most of them unfinished? Why did he paint so laboriously and painfully, he, the great master? Why did he turn more and more away from painting and toward science, to the detriment of his art? What is the secret of the *Monna Lisa*, with her enigmatical smile? What did that smile mean to the artist, that he should portray it in almost every subsequent picture? Why did he, with his physical beauty and vigor, his personal daintiness, his genial nature, shun intercourse with women, and withhold his intimacy even from male friends? In a sensuous and exuberant age his cool deliberation and abstinence seem unaccountable. Geniality and coldness, gentleness and cruelty, strangely oppose each other in him. Glimpses of his private life, as revealed by his diary, show further contradictory traits.

These manifold problems the psycho-analyst undertakes to solve by his method of going back to the child life of the subject. At first glance the data at hand seem meagre enough, but there are significant aspects. Leonardo was an illegitimate child whose father was of much higher rank socially than his mother. The first four years of his life were passed with his mother alone. Then his father married a lady of his rank, and the marriage being childless, Leonardo was taken into the home, and was tenderly cared for. That is all that is certainly known and our clue would be most unsatisfactory were it not for a childhood memory that the artist has set down in some of his writings concerning birds and aeronautics. To quote his own words:

"It seems that I am predestined to be so thoroughly interested in the *vultures*, for as a memory of very early life it comes to my mind that while yet I lay in the cradle a vulture came down to me, opened my mouth with her tail, and many times pressed against my lips with this tail of hers." (p. 19.)

We are convinced that this strange story is more of a fairy tale than an actual reminiscence. It is not a memory of an actual event, but the memory of a fantasy formed after childhood and referred back to childhood because it expresses a wish of infantile sexuality, preserved because of its great emotional significance. We give it this interpretation because very similar formations have often occurred in the dreams of homosexual patients, and the psychoanalytic physician has learned to know the origin of the fancy about sucking the tail of a bird. The symbolic rôle of the vulture is explained by the mythology of several lands, but especially that of Egypt, wherein the goddess of Motherhood, *Mut*, was given the head of a vulture. The vulture was supposed by the ancients to be always a female and to conceive without union with a male. The passive rôle played by the child in Leonardo's reminiscence is significant. While other features of his life played some part in forming his character the relations with father and mother, sketched above, illuminated by this peculiar creation of his fancy, are seen to be the nucleus from which his most striking traits developed. An only, much loved and petted,

child of his mother, he lacked in his infancy the masculine influence of a father. The overtenderness of the mother produced a precocious emotional, that is, sexual, development, with complete fixation upon the mother. The earliest expression of infantile sexuality, that of suckling the mother, remains untransformed in him, giving birth to this fantasy, which also represents another and more direct infantile idea of sexual relation with the mother. The homosexuality that often results from such mother fixations is seen in his passivity. He could not take the normal road of expression for sexual desire because he never outgrew the infantile passivity and the mother-ideal. Later he lived with his father and was for long the only child in the family; therefore he was loved and cherished by the new mother also. The kind stepmother became somewhat identified with his own mother and served to strengthen the mother-fixation. With puberty and the father's influence came partial freedom, and a sublimation into creative work. Yet he always remained unaccountably inactive in some respects (so his biographers say). He spent his affection upon the beautiful youths he gathered about him as pupils, playing a motherly rôle to them. During the early period of his life as a successful artist, including the time that he spent at the court of Ludovico Sforza, at Milan, the mother-complex was not dominant and sublimation was apparently successful.

But when he began the painting of the *Monna Lisa* something occurred that woke the dormant force and made it active, though never fully conscious. Upon this lady's face he saw the very smile of his mother, which was woven into the fabric of his dreams. (p. 47.) The long struggle to complete the picture was the result of an inward struggle in which the infantile love tried to reassert itself and the face of the mother strove to be put upon the canvas. This struggle affected every subsequent picture. The mysterious smile appears upon two faces in the *St. Anne Trio*, and this picture expresses clearly the conflict. (p. 49.) Here are *two* mothers claiming the little son, and the elder does not yield to the younger, for all her tenderness. So he, himself, had had two mothers, and so the conflict between the mother-claim and the claim of adult life is symbolized.

From this time he turns more and more to scientific research, making the requirements of his painting an inadequate excuse for his investigations. Such zeal for knowledge, psychoanalysis has taught us, is a form of *curiosity*, and when carried beyond utilitarian needs it is traceable in its beginning to the infantile sexual curiosity arising from premature development. (p. 65.) The great reinforcement to this natural tendency to scientific investigation which leads him to pursue it in the face of the authorities of his time is due to the rebellion against authority based upon resentment against his father—the representative of authority to the child. The attention he devoted to problems of *flying* is traceable also to the infantile conflict concerning the father. The vulture fantasy is one side of this, the other is the symbolization of masculine potency by flying. It was after the transference to the step-mother that this conflict arose. This change from creative work to study shows the regression in character, regression in expression of the libido, as the infantile mother-complex demands expression and comes in conflict with later ideals. It is a return to passivity. It was not only the experience with *Monna Lisa* that brought about this change. The removal of the father's influence and then of the paternal influence of Duke Ludovico Sforza, which

had tended to bring out his masculine character, played an important part. The conflict between these influences and the older mother fixation accounts for the contradictory traits of character. A minor point is the fact that his subconscious resentment toward his father "the Gentleman" led him to "out-herod Herod" by emphasizing all the outward and inward marks of a gentleman, fine apparel, gentle manners, refined habits, and well-ordered life. (p. 54.)

III

GIOVANNI SEGANTINI

By KARL ABRAHAM, 1911, *Schriften XI.*, 65 p.

"Among the artists of our time," says Dr. Abraham, "Giovanni Segantini looms up as a mighty, independent, personality. His development, his outer and inner life, his art, his work, are of such outstanding peculiarity that he presents to Individual Psychology a whole cluster of unsolved problems. To turn upon these the light of psychoanalytic principles is the goal of the present study. . . . An artist of genius, a great man—as Segantini was—has sufficient claim upon our interest in the fact that he is our contemporary. We shall make no mistake, however, if we expect to gain a rich addition to our general knowledge of the psychology of artists for our pains."

Segantini's aim was not to paint nature merely, although he was a great nature painter. He strove to paint the soul of nature, the meaning of it, or, as he said himself, "to conquer and declare *Work, Love, Motherhood, and Death*." In these four words he names the springs out of which his artistic fancy was always fed and renewed. (4.) His life was ruled by the same powers as his art. For his extraordinary ability we cannot find the ordinary explanations. Parentage, education, advantages, give us no clue. He lost his parents when he was five years of age, was brought up none too carefully by his stepsisters, was placed for several years in a Reformatory as an incorrigible, had no real education. His youth was a constant battle with hostile powers. Segantini writes concerning this problem of his life, "They ask me how, in my almost wild life, I have developed Thought and Art? I do not know how to answer; perhaps one must dig down, for such an explanation, to the roots, through all experiences of the soul into the first, the most remote, activities of childhood." Following this clue we turn to his childhood.

As was said he lost his parents in his sixth year. Ever after he idolized the memory of the dead mother. He remembered her as a tall, delicate, sweet woman "lovely as a sunset in Spring." This last phrase becomes significant when we recall the frequency of sunset light in the pictures of his earlier and his last period, as we shall see. Motherhood and Death became associated in his mind. It seems that she was never strong after his birth, though she lived on for five years, so he always felt that he had been the cause of her death, and this conviction becomes greatly over-conditioned. Artist and neurotic have in their constitutions a strong tendency to this over-weighting of an idea. In both the instinctive life is of abnormal strength, originally, and is, on the other hand, both repressed and sublimated to an unusual degree. Both artist and neurotic stand with one foot outside Reality, in a world of Fancy. (19.) In the neurotic suppressed fancies work out as disease symptoms; in the artist they find expression in creative work, but not in this alone, for the artist

shows, almost always, some neurotic features. Thus Segantini, as artist and neurotic, has over-conditioned his ambivalent feelings toward his mother. He idolizes her beauty, her frailty, her sadness, but his self-reproaches for her death are over-compensations for death-wishes that he has had, in the forgotten years of childhood, against the mother who gave him little cherishing. (His memories of her make no mention of love and care.) Hereafter he paints delicate mothers and sturdy children as expressions of his self-reproach. He associates flowers with young mothers and once strikingly imaged this association in a strange vision, or illusion, when in the Alps. He saw a flower form upon the clouds and then before his eyes it was transformed into a Madonna. He painted this, putting an apple into the hand of the Child, and called the picture "The Fruit of Love." Nature and Motherhood and Death were twined together in his thought, and the three were one.

Turning to another episode of his childhood that is pregnant with meaning, we find him, at the age of twelve, making a drawing of a pretty dead infant, to gratify the weeping young mother. He felt no fear of the corpse, which is certainly unusual, and may perhaps betoken the development of the sadistic side of his nature. He drew the child as *living* and joyous, and felt, for the first time, that through Art the dead could be made to live. This experience strengthened the association between Motherhood and Death. His first picture drawn for the Academy was a Head of Niobe, *another* weeping mother! A tone of melancholy pervades his early pictures, pictures of shepherds lonely with their flocks, against sunset skies. Segantini has said of himself, "My spirit was nourished by a great melancholy, which resounded in my soul in unending sweetness." Tenderness, sweetness, sadness, and death, the motives embodied in his mother, thus ruled him. After his mother's death his father had taken him to the narrow dark streets of a great city, so he lost at once Mother, Home, and Nature. The homesickness for these he never outgrew and sought always to regain them in fancy.

But the second period of his artistic life was a period of joyousness, of color and light, and before we enter into this we must consider for a moment one or two experiences of childhood and youth connected nearly or remotely with his father. The father, after keeping him unhappily in the city for about a year, left him in the care of his stepsister, went to America, and was heard from no more. Segantini never mentions his father but we may guess what resentment may have filled his childish soul. The father deprived him of all that made life pleasant and then deserted him. He grew up an unruly, aggressive spirit, dreaming dreams of future greatness.

He was always a radical, always independent, going his own way, owing no man anything. He was one of those who early rebels against paternal authority, because of resentment toward the father and who preserves this attitude of rebellion and independence through all the storms and changes of puberty, adolescence, and manhood. The boy who most rebels against the father's authority is likely to be he who most closely imitates the character of the powerful and despotic father. So Segantini came, in full maturity, to a period when his will to dominate, and his realization of selfhood, led him to a new sort of artistic expression.

It was now that he went to live as a mountaineer in the Alps, in order to study and to paint the marvelous light and color of the lofty peaks. His artistic aim was to *master* the secrets of painting color

and light, while a deeper, subconscious, motive led him to climb, and to live, far above the dimness, the pettiness, and the confusion, of the valleys. This is the period of enthusiastic joy in his work and of ecstatic love for nature. His own descriptions of his feeling for natural beauty so closely resemble descriptions of the ecstasy of love that there is little room for doubt that his nature love was a sublimation of sexual love. He was happily married now to the only woman he ever loved, but he had love, in his rich nature, left over for Nature and Art. Of formal religion he would have none, so his worship is given to Nature. The motherhood motive is still present, but it now takes on a fuller, more joyous tone of life and of oneness with Nature. At this time he painted "The Two Mothers," showing a human mother and child close by a cow and her calf. This picture is one of his masterpieces. It breathes rest, peace, harmony, quiet strength, and, like all his pictures, it has a meaning. It insists upon the Oneness of Nature and Humanity, with Motherhood as a keynote of both. Other pictures were the "Pagan Mother," and the "Christian Mother." He painted always with purity and refinement, as is seen in his rare treatment of the nude. At all times he shows his infantile fixation but in all his work and life he shows that he was one of the best of sublimators.

He reached his goal, he mastered color and light, in his own way, independently of the work of other artists, and, this phase of his nature satisfied, he swung back, as neurotics do, to a darker, and an older, phase. Like the neurotic he began to retire into the world of fancy, to paint sadness and sorrow in fanciful and symbolic forms. Now came his so-called Nirvana pictures. Now he paints two strange pictures, one, "The Hell of the Voluptuaries" taken from the Buddhist story that bad women and the wicked mother are doomed to wander upon a trackless frozen waste. The other picture represents a dying mother, with a living rosy babe, swaying from a tree in the twigs of which her hair is caught. The posture defies all the laws of nature, but for this Segantini did not care, nor did he deign to explain the picture, showing how all-important the world of fancy had become for him. The picture represents the punishment of a wicked mother, and the plight of the forsaken child. He was the forsaken child, as he was the child of his Madonna, and as his portrait of himself shows Christ-like features. He is expressing here his long repressed and unconscious resentment to the mother who forsook him, and to whom his feelings were so pronouncedly ambivalent. This strange picture, viewed in the light of his mother complex becomes one of the most significant he ever painted. The sadism aroused when he drew the sketch of the dead child for the weeping mother is re-awakened now, as other activities at this time show.

Following this period comes the period when he painted Death, notably his picture of the "Return Home." The last phase of the complex is now finding expression. At this time he dreams of death, and, being somewhat superstitious, he attaches meaning to the dreams. He was living now high up in an Alpine hut, working with a superhuman energy. He was taken ill and in his fever he got up repeatedly, went out into the bitter air, and worked upon his paintings. He refused a doctor also, and so, finally, he died from the effects of the exposure and over-exertions, since the illness itself was not likely to prove fatal. This feverish activity of his has been generally attributed to his abounding zeal for work, but in view of the death dreams shortly preceding it, in view of the cycle of mental

evolution which he was completing, based upon his complex of Motherhood and Death, it seems very likely that this was a case of unconscious suicide. Such cases are not so rare as might be thought. Many a seeming accident is a suicide, *purposive* but *unconscious*. Segantini had accomplished his object, he had lived to paint Nature, Motherhood, Love, and Death. He had conquered his world, and each phase of his great motivating complex dominated him in turn, and the last was death. He expiated the old, fancied wrong of having been the cause of his mother's death. This dark thought had been long repressed but it came into its own at last. "Gladly he lived and gladly died, and laid him down with a Will."

"This psychoanalytic survey which has given us a glimpse of the battle between conscious and unconscious powers, allows us, perhaps, to grasp this inner strife and sympathize with it. It reveals to us the whole tragedy of the great artist so early dead, which was that the shadow of death walked with him, *him*, the untiring creator, all the way." Thus Dr. Abraham concludes his study, and this conclusion is convincing in some sense at least.

IV

ANDREA DEL SARTO'S ART, AND THE INFLUENCE OF HIS WIFE

By ERNEST JONES, *Imago*, Vol. II, 1913, p. 468-480

For many generations of art critics it has been inexplicable why Andrea del Sarto, in spite of his admirable contributions to every line of painting, is yet not an artist of the first rank. The more carefully his work is analysed in detail the greater is the admiration of the beholder and yet more of the connoisseur. His drawing is unexcelled in correctness, he was the best colorist of his time, surpassed in this line only by the Venetian School. He was a past-master of chiaroscuro, his compositions were of an almost perfect harmony, his frescoes show us the highest achievement in that realm of art up to the present. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that he was called by his own very critical contemporaries "the painter without fault," which is the more significant when we consider that he lived in Florence at the very time that Raphael and Michael Angelo were producing their masterpieces, when the art of the Renaissance reached its highest point. In spite of all this we are confronted with the fact that Andrea del Sarto never reached true greatness in his art, that his work lacked something essential which robbed it of any claim to rank with the first masters.

All the biographers and critics, from Andrea's own time down to the present, are practically agreed on this point and most are agreed in saying that it is because our artist possessed talent in high degree and yet lacked that intangible but essential quality of inspiration or super-ability—call it what you will—that we name Genius. The inspiration of an inner light, a bright ideal, the divine touch, is wanting in him. Robert Browning has given us the most complete and profound psychological analysis of Andrea's strength and weakness yet given, in his poem "Andrea del Sarto." The psychoanalyst would accept Browning's analysis in full, only further interpreting it.

"I can do with my pencil what I know,
What I see, what at bottom of my heart
I wish for, if I ever wish so deep—
Do easily, too—when I say, perfectly,

I do not boast, perhaps.
 . . . I do what many dream of all their lives . . .
 There burns a truer light of God in them,
 In their vexed, beating, stuffed, and stopped up brain,
 Heart, or what e'er else, than goes on to prompt
 This law-pulsed forthright craftsman's hand of mine.
 Their work drops ground-ward, but themselves, I know,
 Reach many a time a heaven that's shut to me,
 Enter and take their place there, sure enough
 Though they come back and cannot tell the world.
 My works are nearer heaven, but I sit here. . . .
 Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp,
 Or what's a heaven for? All is silver grey
 Placid and perfect with my art: The worse!"

The poem goes on to show that in addition to, and perhaps as a cause of, this lack of the divine fire, the artist is hampered and pressed down in his work by his mercenary, selfish, domineering wife, whom none the less he slavishly adores.

"But had you—oh, with the same perfect brow,
 And perfect eyes, and more than perfect mouth,
 And the low voice my soul hears, as a bird
 The fowler's pipe, and follows to the snare—
 Had you, with these the same, but brought a mind!
 Some women do so. Had the mouth there urged
 God and the glory! never care for gain,
 The present by the future, what is that?
 Live for fame, side by side with Agnolo!
 Rafael is waiting: up to God, all three!
 I might have done it for you. So it seems
 Perhaps not. All is as God over-rules."

The poet and the biographers are undoubtedly right in casting much of the blame for Andrea's failure upon his wife. Yet other artists have not needed the inspiration of a noble woman in order to reach the highest achievement, other artists have struggled against every human obstacle and have won. This, too, the poet recognizes, and concludes that the lack was, after all, in the artist, though without the millstone round his neck he might have soared into the upper air. The psychoanalyst would add to the poet's interpretation a further analysis of Andrea's relation to his wife Lucretia. It is known that she was cold, mercenary, without understanding of his art, jealous,—soulless, one would say—a woman who sucked him dry of everything and gave him nothing—except her beauty. She made him desert his own parents, whose only support he was, and take the support of her family upon his hands. She grew restive and jealous when he was in France painting for Francis I, enjoying the opportunity of a life time, and called him back to her, regardless of the dishonorableness of breaking his contract and leaving unfinished the work for which he had already been paid. Because of her tyranny he lived in poverty and dishonor painting with always more facility and perfection of technique and always less of spirit and meaning, until he became, as he calls himself, nothing more than a craftsman. Andrea submitted to her and adored her to the last, yet he would be more than human did he not feel and resent all this, especially as he very well knew that without her throttling hands about his throat he might have

attained the honor and distinction won by Rafael, Angelo, and Leonardo. He loved her, it is true, but the under side of his love was hate, and it was strong in proportion to his love. His feelings were *ambivalent*, and hence arose a bitter conflict because Lucrezia was always there. Had she been unfaithful to him or had she died, he might have, from the conflict involved in his resentment, sorrow, or pain, released his pent-up emotion in great works, comparable to, or surpassing, the works of Leonardo da Vinci. But he could not get away from her, and moreover he loved her as a woman loves a man. He was naturally bent toward homosexuality, and this presents another ground of conflict. She kept him from his man friends in addition to all the other injuries. He was her willing captive, of course. Quoting Browning again, we hear:

"So—still they overcome,
Because there's still Lucrezia—as I choose."

Yes, he consciously chose her but unconsciously he hated her and rebelled against her tyranny. So the ever present conflict of every day of life absorbed his strength. It could not even be pushed back to the original infantile setting—which in Andrea's case we know nothing about—from thence to find a new outlet, as Leonardo's did, because Lucrezia remained the all-absorbing motive of his life. This brings us back again to the question, "Was it her fault after all, when all is said and done? Was there not some fundamental lack in the character of a man who could so submit to the stifling, crushing influence of such a woman?" and again the psychoanalyst confirms the poet's verdict. We do not know anything of significance about Andrea del Sarto's early life and development, so we cannot find the first beginnings of his defects, as it is the business of psychoanalysis to do, but we can say with a measure of confidence that early influences had so shaped his character as to make him a ready victim to any domineering woman who could please his artist's eye. Such was his weakness, his masochistic tendency, that he must have submitted to some one, and had it not been Lucrezia del Fede, it would have been another like her. This does not exonerate her, but it places some of the responsibility upon the poet's own psychological constitution. It was not lack of ability that kept him down, however, it was a tangled and wrongly directed complex of emotions which centered about this wife of his. Could he have lived in a world of men, of artists, alone, he might have found a worthy self-expression. Or if he could have been two, as Browning makes him say, if he could have been a larger, broader, personality, so that he could have reacted otherwise upon his daily difficulties, then he might have shown the genius of the creator, instead of the mere talent of the craftsman. He might have been an artist, whereas he was only a painter.

V

THE PROBLEM OF HAMLET AND THE "OEDIPUS-COMPLEX"

By ERNEST JONES. (*American Journal of Psychology*, Vol. XXI, 1910, 72-113. Translated into German by Paul Tausig, Wien, 1911. The references in the abstract given below are to the German edition).

The problem of "Hamlet" has been called the "modern Sphinx," and an endless array of chapters, and whole books, have been devoted to the attempt to unravel the mystery of why Hamlet could not

perform the task that he so clearly saw to be his duty. The claim of this drama upon our interest rests not only upon its mystery, however, but yet more upon its high artistic and literary excellence. It is on a higher level than any of Shakespeare's other works, and is taken commonly to represent the greatest achievement of his genius. Although Shakespeare was the least subjective of poets we may fairly assume that in Hamlet we have something of himself—perhaps the core of his philosophy, for no man could touch such spiritual heights and depths without putting his own soul into the written word. If we could solve the mystery of Hamlet, therefore, we should have a new insight into the character and genius of Hamlet's creator.

The explanations that have been put forth hitherto are opposed to the context of the play itself. Hamlet was *not* a contemplative spirit, incapable of decisive action, as Goethe suggests. He showed himself a man of quick and decisive action in his dealings with the Ghost, with Polonius, with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, and with Laertes. It was only in the one case of his revenge upon his uncle that he could not act. The task was *not* rendered impossible by external circumstances. The reader, or the spectator, is clearly given to understand that Hamlet was the idol of the people and would have had their support in anything he did. Nor was there a moral conflict between the task of revenge imposed upon him and his Christian feeling of repugnance to human vengeance. There is no indication of such a conflict in his soliloquies, though there is unmistakable evidence of a mental conflict which was not fully conscious. Such a moral conflict as the above would have been inevitably conscious. The solution is not that he *would* do the deed but *cannot*, nor that he *could*, but *will not*, it is that he *cannot will*, because there is a repugnance to the task that he himself cannot understand because he is unaware of its source. He knows his duty yet he keeps finding excuses, like a reluctant school-boy, always trivial excuses, always different excuses. Who of us does not know that when we give ever-changing reasons for a course of action, each one of which we realize to be inadequate, the real reason is one which we will not acknowledge or one which we do not know? We only know that we have a compelling impulse. In Hamlet's case there is deep remorse for his conduct, and his sense of guilt is easily aroused. He is deeply depressed, his attitude towards the world and towards life is one of tragic hopelessness, yet he has a dread of death. His repeated reference to bad dreams, his self accusations, his desperate efforts to get away from the thoughts of his duty, and his vain attempts to find an excuse for his recalcitrancy, all point to a tortured conscience, to some hidden ground for shirking his task, a ground which he cannot or dare not avow to himself. (p. 21.) This state of feeling surely points to an unconscious conflict, which we may try to investigate and explain by means of psychoanalysis. In looking through the play we find abundant evidence, in Hamlet's relations to various characters, that that strongest of repressed complexes, the Oedipus-Complex of infantile sexuality, played its part in Hamlet's life.

His love for his mother is strong and ardent, although it is mixed with condemnation and horror, because of her guilty union with the king. His greatest horror is for the incest of his uncle and his mother, and not for the murder of his father by the uncle. (p. 45.) The physical loathing he felt for this is a common symptom of sexual

conflict. It was not mere jealousy of his mother's affection that made him so resent her marriage, nor mere respect for convention or for his father's memory. It was a projection of his own guilty thought, of the suppressed and unconscious desire, born in childhood, to possess his mother for himself. When his father died the repressed wish stirred and woke, though it did not emerge into consciousness. His attachment to Ophelia (p. 42) was perhaps caused by his desire to play her off against his mother, since she was the opposite type of woman. His coarse jests with Ophelia and most of his attentions to her also were carried out under the eyes of his mother. Everyone who knows children knows how the youngest of them play one person off against another, with infantile jealousy and coquetry.

The second marriage of his mother aroused his buried wish concerning her yet more effectually and the marriage with the usurper was condemned as incest with an access of loathing due to his subconscious incestuous desire. The conflict of these struggling unconscious desires with his rational morals wrecked him as it has wrecked many a neurasthenic known to us to-day. An indication of how *near* to consciousness his guilty wish came is found in his cry "O my prophetic soul, my Uncle!" when the ghost informed him of the murderer. His first reaction after this revelation is against Ophelia, revealing the sexual nature of the conflict. It is both a reaction against women in general and against her hypocritical prudery. (p. 43.) His sexual feelings are now being powerfully repressed, in the effort to repress that horrible, struggling, unknown desire. But losing Ophelia only increases the conflict with the repressed mother love. "His detestation of his uncle is the jealous detestation of one evil-doer towards his successful fellow." (p. 44.) Therefore he cannot denounce him freely without bringing his own guilt to consciousness. His moral fate is bound up with his uncle's. The call of duty to slay his uncle cannot be obeyed because it links itself with the call of nature to slay his mother's husband, whether first or second husband. The latter call is strongly repressed and therefore the former is also repressed. Hamlet spoke more truly than he knew when he cried out, "I am prompted to the deed by heaven and hell!"

There are secondary elaborations of the father-son complex in the Polonius and Laertes parts of the plot. The tedious and futile character of Polonius and Hamlet's contemptuous treatment of him are disguised presentations of filial resentment toward the hampering and pestiferous rivalry and control of the aged parent or friend. Hamlet satisfied the requirement of the popular myth, which is but a race-dream, by slaying Polonius, since he could not slay his own father. The various sagas on the Oedipus theme show in different guises the tyrant father. Sometimes it is a great-uncle, as in the Romulus myth, sometimes a grandfather, who opposed the marriage of the parents (a father-daughter complex, the complement of the Oedipus complex, enters here). Here there is a doubling of the parts and a division of the characteristics between the two persons. Polonius represents not the tyrannical side of the father, but the interfering, tiresome, superannuated person, whose main offence is that he is in the way.

The story of Hamlet was a well known saga, which Shakespeare took up, altered, and adapted to his purpose, according to his custom. The significance of the drama for Shakespeare's own personality and history does not lie in his selection of this particular story—

for he could scarcely have missed choosing one with a similar theme—but in the *alterations* which he made in it. In most popular versions of the saga Hamlet takes his vengeance after overcoming numerous external difficulties. Why did Shakespeare make the difficulty a subjective one and the conflict a psychological battle veiled in mystery? Why, unless in hearing the original story his heart was stirred with the feeling of kinship, with a sense that *he* had been in a similar spiritual situation and a realization that he would not have met it as Hamlet of the saga did? How could he so clearly depict an unconscious conflict unless he had felt such a one in his own soul? It is a suggestive fact that the drama of Hamlet appeared the year after Shakespeare's father died (1602). Could this event have waked the sleeping complex in the poet's soul, causing him to write that which he knew not fully—like Jensen in his *Gradiva*—and to express thus the pain and grief that oppressed him without revealing their source? The play of Hamlet is the essence of Greek Tragedy in that it depicts the desperate, unavailing, struggle against Fate. The Fate is Hamlet's own Will to Death, which is so much stronger than his Will to Life that it makes all his efforts to overcome his difficulties involve him only in deeper mire. It is Fate, in that the Will to Death is an unconscious force, completely beyond the control of his conscious will. (p. 64.)

Whether or not this be the true explanation of the Hamlet mystery, it more nearly satisfies the requirements than any other that has been put forth. If the psychoanalysts are right in their description of the "Oedipus-Complex" as "fundamental and universal it is only fitting that the greatest work of the world-poet should have been concerned with the deepest problem and the intensest conflict that has occupied the mind of man, with the revolt of Youth and of Love against the fetters which jealous Age imposes upon them." (p. 65.)

VI

ON DANTE'S UNCONSCIOUS SOUL-LIFE

By ALICE SPERBER, *Imago*, 1914, Vol. III

This study does not pretend to be exhaustive, nor does it attempt to explain Dante's genius. Its aim is rather to throw some light upon his personality and upon his career as a poet. It leaves room for much further study of the same theme.

"The problem of Dante's nature and of his creations consists in the co-existence of bold revolt and humble obedience, of admirable new thinking and slavish belief in authority. The same man who hurled wild curses at the Papacy was the truest son of the Church. The poet who leaves no heart untouched could never free himself from the cold formalism of the scholastics. The scholar who was the first to dare to expound scientific problems in the Italian instead of in the Latin tongue—and also the first to solve in so spirited a manner the complicated problem of Italian written language—restrains his boldest flights of thought and rests upon the authority of Aristotle and the Bible. How comes it that this universal, genial, and courageous spirit languished, as if through a spell, in the chains of authoritative dogmas, while Petrarch, who was certainly not so courageous, dared in the fourteenth century, to assert that Aristotle was not the court of last appeal for Science, and Leonardo da Vinci, in the fifteenth, launched boldly forth on scientific investigations while yet the authority of the Church was supreme?" (p. 248.)

If we look for the answer to these questions to the soul-life of the poet and to his childish experiences, we shall find, in his writings and history, material at least as valuable as that we found for Leonardo da Vinci. If Leonardo revolted against authority because of the animus against his father, Dante clung to authority because of a love and reverence for his parents and a conflict that had made him find gratification in submission. He lost his mother in his early childhood, but just how early is not known. His many references to mother-love and mother ways make it seem certain that he dimly remembered a mother, whose memory was enhanced by the very dim, remote, uncertainty of his hold upon it. For instance, he speaks of "a mother comforting her frightened child," and a "child who hangs his head in conscious guilt before a mother." It is the nature of such references as these that gives us the needed clue.

The most significant feature of his life, apparently, and for his poetic works—and therefore for his emotional experience—was his relation to Beatrice. So disproportionate is the extent of his actual acquaintance with her to the rôle which she plays in his writings that some critics do not hesitate to say that she had no real personal existence, but was an abstract creation of Dante's fancy, and that she symbolizes philosophy. Boccaccio, however, relates her history and her connection with Dante in full. Whether she was real or ideal is, after all, of less importance to our problem than the determination of what she meant to Dante. There can be no doubt but that she was idealized. In her we may discern the nature of his ideal of perfect womanhood.

In the *Divine Comedy* she is again and again compared to a mother, while the poet compares himself to a fearful, guilty, or shamed child. Beatrice adopts a stern and rebuking demeanor toward him, for his soul's good. (p. 210.) Dante feels himself humbled and "dissolved in tears" when she reproaches him for having given his love to other women, or when she smiles at his childish reasoning. He is at once humbled and comforted, and he delights to represent Beatrice in the character of an authoritative and commanding parent. These passages give the clearest possible indications of masochistic tendencies, that is, the desire to experience pain or punishment at the hands of the beloved one. It is very evident that the quality most valued in Beatrice was her firmness, her masculine trait. In one passage he compares her to an admiral assembling his men for battle, and in another to an eagle.

On the other hand he looks upon his guide in the *Inferno* and *Purgatory*, Vergil, as a father, and describes him as all mildness and tenderness. (240.) He sometimes compares him also to a mother. What history tells of Dante's father indicates that he was a man of little force. Perhaps Dante idealized his weakness, or perhaps he was really the sort of father that Dante pictures in Vergil. He died in the poet's eighteenth year. At any rate it appears, from the characterizations of Beatrice and Vergil, that the positions of the two parents were somewhat reversed. His love for the mother and for her representative, Beatrice, was of the submissive sort, not the aggressive, and his attitude toward his father was more that of a son to a mother.

In the *Vita Nuova*, written in his younger days, Beatrice is invested with only a few motherly traits. This work is like the works of the minnesingers and troubadours in its extravagant exaltation of the lady and the abasement of the lover, and cannot therefore be

taken exclusively as an expression of Dante's own personality but should be taken also as an expression of a dominant note of the age. But a point of interest, for our study, in the *Vita Nuova*, is his repeated presentiments, fears, and dreams of the death of Beatrice. If such dreams are the fruit of unconscious wishes, then Dante, perhaps, expresses feelings here of which he did not know the spring. In his grief and abasement at his lady's slighting treatment he may have wished her dead and so in his power, but back of this lay deeper wishes. His mother is dead and Beatrice is identified with her. His mother's sternness no doubt aroused revolt, when he was a very little child, and the infantile wish for her death followed. The death wish is very much in keeping with the masochistic complex, as psychoanalyses of neurotics (219) have shown. His play upon the number nine in connection with Beatrice (217) may mean another link in his unconscious identification of her with his mother. He met her when she was beginning her ninth year and he was closing his. They met again after nine years. She died upon the ninth day of the ninth month. He himself connects the number symbolically with the Trinity but the psychoanalyst would say that the whole complex might have sprung from the unconscious association with the nine months of pregnancy, in motherhood.

The character of Dante's parents and his relation to both, as indicated by the material in his writings, may now be pointed out as the answer to the question: "Why did his bold and brilliant intellect remain shackled in medieval orthodoxy?" The mild and non-interfering, yet revered father could arouse no revolt, and as respect for authority usually grows from or exists with respect for parental authority, Dante had no impulse to emancipate himself. The dominance of the mother held him yet more, especially as she was idealized as a Saint in heaven, whom he hoped to join there. Beatrice, dying early also, strengthened this lure of the other world, and helped to keep his feet in the path that was supposed to lead thither. The bonds of affection formed in early childhood are stronger than any voice of Reason.

In conclusion we will take up a significant dream recorded in the ninth canto of the *Purgatorio*. He dreamed that an eagle came down, seized him, and carried him upward as far as the zone of fire which separates earth from heaven. He thought the place from which he was taken was the very place from which Ganymede had been snatched away, and that this therefore was the eagle's usual hunting place. When he reached the fire it burned him and he awoke. In his waking he compares himself to Achilles, who wakes thus, ignorant of his whereabouts, when his mother, Thetis, carried him to Scyros in order to keep him from the Trojan War, and, further to insure his safety dressed him as a girl. We have seen the mother symbolism of the vulture in the Leonardo analysis. The eagle has a similar significance. Long study of the fire symbol in dreams and in popular speech, has brought its sexual significance to light. Entering the fire here represents the culmination of sexual life—the entry into paradise—and Dante is only like a million other dreamers whom the Censor wakes at this point because the dream becomes unbearable.

The Ganymede and Achilles elements are significant. Both had mortal fathers and nymphs or goddesses for mothers. (235.) Dante's mother became to him an immortal, an angel, while yet he was very young. The strength and beauty of Achilles and Ganymede repre-

sent many ideals also, leading to his identification of himself with them. Both the Ganymede and Achilles myths are homosexual. This does not indicate homosexuality in Dante, but bisexuality, as his historical character also shows. It is generally believed that a high degree of bisexuality is always present in the artistic temperament. The feminine qualities of Shakespeare have been noted by students of literature.

To return to the eagle again, it is elsewhere used as a symbol of power and is also closely associated with Beatrice. In one passage she is represented as looking straight at the sun, like an eagle, and while he was with her Dante *found himself able to do this also*. (237.) St. Augustine has said that only those young eaglets that can look upon the sun are acknowledged as Sons of Eagles, while the others are thrown from the eyrie. So Dante, knowing this passage perhaps, through another thread of unconscious association makes himself the Son of the Eagle. His dream of being carried thus upward represents also a wish for death, a revival, mayhap, of the old childish wish that his angel mother would come down and take him up with her. So Achilles, destined for early death, was placed by his mother on the isle of Seuke, identified by Pliny as the Isle of Souls.

That the mental and spiritual development of Dante was strongly determined by his father and mother in their relations to each other and to him—these relations being unusual, is almost beyond doubt. That he owes to the parent-complex some measure of his poetic fame also is our claim. Beatrice is clearly seen to be his great inspiration, but behind Beatrice stands her prototype, the mother. As both these objects of his love were withdrawn early from earthly contact, his fancy was drawn after them to another world where he hoped to find them again. Hence the longing and the divine discontent that caused him to explore the regions of the soul, and to write in deathless numbers the experiences of his soul on its journey.

VII

THE LOVE-LIFE OF NICOLAUS LENAU

By J. SADGER, 1909, *Schriften VI*, 98 p.

Nicolaus Lenau, the great Austrian lyric-poet, presents to us a problem of life and character as well as of genius peculiarly fascinating to the clinician. That he was neurotic in disposition is apparent to the layman. His temperamental oddities, his passionate individualism, his piteous end in the darkness of paralysis and manic-depressive insanity, are enough to indicate that there is material for pathological analysis. For the psychoanalyst there is added his intellectual and emotional attitude, called *Welt-Schmerz*, his celibacy, and his unusual love affair with Sophie Löwenthal. About this latter feature of his life this study is centered, as it includes or touches upon all the significant events or tendencies that are needed for a psychoanalytical explanation of Lenau's unusual character, and the expression given to his genius.

In investigating this great passion of his life we ask, and attempt to answer, three questions: First, What really were Lenau's relations to Sophie Löwenthal? Second, Did these relations cause in any way his final illness and mental derangement? Third, How did

they influence his creative work, his character, and his spiritual development?

From the passionate love letters—some of the most beautiful in the German language,—as well as from what is known of Lenau's intercourse with Sophie, we know that they were lovers in everything but the breaking of the woman's marriage bond. Sophie was the wife of Lenau's friend, Max Löwenthal, who never, apparently, objected to the affair, which extended over years, although Lenau treated Sophie as a lover would, in every way. One question, How could such a relation go so far without going farther? The received answer is that the lady's virtue and faith were unassailable but this is scarcely consistent with the freedom with which she yielded herself to her lover in everything but breaking her marriage vow. The psychoanalyst finds the solution of this inconsistency in the fact, well supported by statements in her diary and letters, that she was sexually anaesthetic. This was one of the symptoms of the hysteria which manifested itself in various ailments and moods, and which, of course, was conditioned by infantile complexes. In this brief summary there is not space for an analysis of Sophie's character, which Sadger has admirably carried out. Suffice it to say that her attraction to Lenau was conditioned by features of resemblance that he bore to her father and that her neurotic disposition, *plus* her anaesthesia, were potent factors in holding him to her through the years, although she gave him fully as much pain as pleasure.

Lenau had much in his childhood experience to prevent a normal development. His heredity was poor, his father died when the boy was only five, his mother idolized him above everything else in the world and indulged him boundlessly. The effects of her over-indulgence and of the unwholesome habits she allowed him to form were apparent throughout his life and notorious in his circle. She "waited on him hand and foot" as the vernacular has it, and pampered his body without stint. The result of all this was that he preserved his infantile mother-fixation just as Sophie preserved her father-fixation, and therefore each fulfilled the other's ideal, and they loved each other passionately. They never found it too hard to keep Sophie's marriage vow intact just because they loved in an infantile way. Each received from the other just what he and she had been accustomed to receive from mother and father—and no more.

Not less important than the mother's influence was that of Lenau's father, in a different way. The latter died, of tuberculosis, when Nicolaus was five years old. His only memory of his father—as he relates in after-life—was that of the tall, sick, white-clothed man, rising up and giving him a box on the ear because he was too noisy. It was a memory that rankled. On his mother's account his feeling toward his father was ambivalent, and this incident enhanced the antagonistic attitude, which gathered round it and crystallized his emotions into fear and hatred. It was soon after the father's death that the six year old child wept for half a day because he must sometime die. In after years this experience came out in his morbid fears and fancies about Sophie's death—he had them most when his longing for wife and children was greatest, and so, in spite of his love for her there was an unconscious, or possibly conscious, rebellion against her sway. His childish terror at the thought of death the psychoanalyst knows to have been the result of the fulfillment of his death wish against his father and fears were roused

about Sophie on a similar ground. This incident gave rise to another significant mental state in later life. He more than once confessed that he always feared a "stroke" and when, near the end, a stroke of paralysis came to him he recognized it as the fulfillment of his presentiment. Sophie wrote, just after this, a consoling letter in which she innocently quoted the words:

"Duck, and let it go over you,
The storm must have its will."

He vehemently crossed out the word "Duck" and wrote "I will NOT duck!!!!" reiterating the denial on subsequent occasions. A complex was obviously touched, the complex that started in the incident of his father's blow, the nucleus of a mass of fears and resentments.

Three times Lenau fell in love and hoped to be married, and the first and second times the infantile fixation upon his mother blocked the move. His second love, Caroline Unger, was a woman who demanded service of him instead of becoming his slave, as all other women had done. Perhaps we do not need to trace his break with her back to his filial complex, but at any rate she was very different in this from his mother, which is some grist for the psychoanalytic mill. After he knew Sophie Löwenthal she was a factor in keeping him from marriage. She could never bring herself to encourage him, though she knew she could not fully satisfy or make him happy. This made her feel more guilty, in her heart, than if she had actually transgressed the laws of society for his sake. He, on the other hand, was ambivalent toward her because of her failure, as is shown in his attitude after his insanity developed. His attitude toward her was that of a child to his mother. (76.) He loved her passionately, yet he felt the restraint she exercised over him, and he longed for marriage and children, which, he once declared, were the only realities. Toward the close of his life he became actually betrothed to Marie Behrens much to Sophie's disgust, but his illness and insanity intervened, so that marriage was never consummated. During this time he was obsessed with the fear of Sophie's death, meaning, as we have seen, that he subconsciously wished her out of the way. After the insanity developed he feared to receive her letters, but after he had them he covered them with kisses, showing how he both loved and hated her—as he had loved and hated both his parents.

Now we may give the formal answer to the three questions propounded at the beginning of this study. We have sufficiently described the real relationship of Lenau and Sophie Löwenthal. They were lovers but they never sinned against the social law. As for the second question we may say that in spite of Sophie's influence, not by any means all for good, the paralysis and insanity are not to be laid at her door. They were directly caused by an attack of syphilis he had following an adventure at Bremen. But the form of his delusions, and possibly the moment of the inception of the mental disturbance were determined by his relations with Sophie, and these, pushing further back, were the results of the infantile sexual fixations of both Nicolaus and Sophie.

As to the third question—what relation had her personality to his creative work and his spiritual development, we may say that her influence was next in power to his mother's. She was the inspiration of his *Liebesklängen*, the loveliest of his poems. She furnished an

object for his love—for his libido—and yet denied him full satisfaction, so to her influence must be attributed a part of the *Welt Schmerz* that pervades his work—the feeling of something lacking. Of course, we reiterate, this is further traceable to his mother's character and to the conduct on her part that fostered his selfish individualism. But for Sophie, however, he might have outgrown his infantile fixations more completely.

VIII

HEINRICH VON KLEIST

(A pathographic-psychological study), by J. SADGER, *Grenzfragen des Nerven und Seelenlebens*, 1910, p. 5-63

The life of a poet is here described to whom the good gods granted in his cradle a rich and powerful talent, but to whom they denied that essential to happiness, moderation—self-control.

Heinrich von Kleist was the fifth of his father's seven children. The father was a Prussian officer; the mother, we learn by chance from a letter, had that intense sensibility and instability that were inherited by her son, and that is all we know of the parents. For a clue to his heredity we must turn to the indirect evidence of more distant relatives. Ulrike, his half-sister on the father's side, was a born nomad, possessed with an irresistible *wanderlust*. When she could not actually travel it was her joy to take "map-journeys." In mature years she developed traits that point to senile dementia. Kleist's cousin on his mother's side early became the victim of melancholia, and committed suicide. These facts make it probable that Kleist had a poor heredity on both sides. The expected stigmata in his case would be: chronic depression and longing for death, the most intense happiness in love for a short time, which is involved in the incapacity to bring his ego into harmony with anything else, and, finally, boundless extravagance in every direction. Does he exhibit these? We have the testimony of Zschokke and Bülow that he suffered from melancholy from earliest youth. (p. 6.)

The second stigma, the hereditary incapacity to "fit in," is certainly present. It is shown by his *wanderlust*, his inability to adapt himself to regular duties, regular responsibility, to regular relations of any sort, or to adopt a settled profession. His wanderings are attempts to escape the unhappiness in his soul. Every new trouble is the stimulus to a journey, with what end he knows not; the only purpose is to flee. The same opposition to settled relationships is shown in his affairs with women. In the space of fourteen years nine had caught his fancy, but none had made a really deep impression. The engagement with Wilhelmine was broken off entirely by his fault, because of his neglect and inconstancy, and it was well indeed that it never culminated in marriage. He could have made no woman happy.

The same inconstant character showed in his attempts to find a vocation. He would have liked to be everything! He was successively soldier, student, teacher, volunteer in the Technical Deputation, poet, state-employee, newspaper-publisher and editor, besides many other callings of which he merely dreamed, but which he never really attempted. In one of his letters he says, "I feel myself altogether incapable of placing myself in any conventional relationship with the world." If anything could attract him and hold him it was,

as is so frequently the case with the hereditary neurotic, an academic career, with its freedom of learning, or else the career of a writer, since both of these allow frequent change of objective. For, stronger than his native capacities, mightier than his genius, greater than his poetic ability, was his opposition to subjecting himself to fixed routine. He once remarked significantly, "There is nothing consistent in me, except inconsistency!"

The immoderateness that characterized his sensations, his efforts, his actions, may well have had its cause in this same instability. At the University he enrolled for so many studies that the Professors themselves thought he had taken too much, and he declared "If I manage to carry it, then I can with right assert that I have made the impossible possible." His ambition knew no bounds, nor did he limit his demands upon others. His friends truly saw that this ambition was pathological and he himself glimpsed the truth. He knew that if he did not reach his goal quickly, by an extreme effort, he would never reach it. He knew his time was short, his power limited. "Hell gave me this half-talent," he wrote. "Heaven gives to mankind either a whole or else none."

We have abundantly seen that von Kleist had the stigmata deduced from his heredity. We shall see further on that these traits have also a psycho-sexual explanation, and that this fact is not in contradiction with their hereditary character. To the inborn nervous instability is added a series of experiences which gives to his character its special forms and colors. The first of these psychic components is homosexuality. We do not mean to say that Kleist was guilty of any gross expressions of this, and we do not mean to say that in this he was worse than other men. There is an epoch in the life of every man and woman when he or she is most strongly attracted to the like sex, and this epoch is normally before maturity, or, sometimes, in old age. It is by far most frequent and most violent in puberty, as we all well know. In the neurotic and the mentally diseased this normal phase is exaggerated and prolonged, and so it may be also in the poet and the artist. Letters of Kleist are extant to prove that he loved at least one friend with the fervor of sexual passion, and he almost recognized its character himself (p. 14), although he must hold to the name of "friendship" and deny that of "love" to his passion. Such a love did he give to his teacher Martini, and the influence that Martini had over him was vital for more than ten years. Martini imparted to him a thirst for knowledge. He rushed, like a true *Schwer-Belasteter*, into remotest realms of learning. Even while in military service he was more of a student than a soldier. An outcome of his love for other friends was the youthful sin of masturbation, which he afterward turned from with bitter self reproach.

But in the years of puberty love for the other sex developed also, that is, he was bi-sexual. After his first disappointment here he sought refuge in philosophy, as so many neurotics do, as a refuge from the actual and the sensual. Many turn to pure mathematics, as the most abstract of studies, and Kleist himself became absorbed in Geometry. Then he went to Frankfort to study science, with the secret hope, also, of finding another teacher for his heart. Besides, his beloved half-sister Ulrike was there, the dearest relative he had. She too was homosexual, and as masculine as the poet was feminine. She was the only person who thoroughly understood him. While at Frankfort he wrote much on the theme of Virtue as the only

road to happiness. Clinical experience leads Sadger to think that this youthful pre-occupation with and worship of virtue is always an over-compensation for the childhood sin of masturbation. His longing for trust and confidence, his need of confiding in his friends and being understood by them, his passionate desire to have no secrets among friends, to be perfectly frank and open, is also an over-compensation for the secrecy of that indulgence. The love for abstract studies, as "pure" mathematics, is another such compensation. A further symptom in his blushing, embarrassment, and stuttering in company.

A further instance of his homosexual attachment to the teacher Martini is his very evident imitation of him in the didactic letters he writes to Wilhelmine, his betrothed. These letters are rather strange in another particular, coming from a twenty-three year old lover. He talks to Wilhelmine of coming motherhood, of her high destiny as mother of his children, he tells her that he longs to mould her into such a wife and especially such a mother as he could wish. He does not love her for herself indeed, but only as the material out of which he can form a woman to suit him. He pictures her in fancy with two children at her feet and one in her lap. As he had two younger brothers and sisters this might well be a reproduction of one of the earliest experiences of his childhood, a picture of his mother with her three youngest children, one of whom is himself. We know now, says Sadger, that homosexuality springs from the unconscious persistence of the boy's first love—his love for his mother. The homosexual impulse is a turning to the womanly attributes in men because other women are rivals to the mother. When he seeks women he seeks those of whom his mother is the prototype. He really seeks her. His mother died when he was very young. His erotic life took two directions, homosexuality and masturbation.

In Kleist's relation to his fiancée we get a significant diaphysis, the Würzburg Journey, which has been a puzzle to all the biographers. Of the many solutions offered it is probable that all have a grain of truth, that the truth is a combination of the various motives assigned, for we have come to realize that few psychological motives are simple. It was the poetic call, and not only that but the result of depression of spirits and the fear of psychical impotence, because of a congenital anomaly, which led him to seek advice of a physician, although this fear, awakened by his correspondence with Wilhelmine concerning their approaching marriage, was undoubtedly the occasion of it. He did not go to a renowned physician, however, but to a "wise, noble, and old friend," Brockes, to whom he made a general confession and on whom he depended for help and advice. From Brockes he receives both help and comfort. With self-sacrificing zeal this friend stood by him "like a mother!", so Kleist's account runs. He succeeds Martini in the heart of Kleist and gains over the poet an equally strong influence, an influence which is indicated by a significant change in the poet's ideal at this time. It is no longer "to know" but "to do," that he aspires, to lose himself in selfless service. This ideal has always found its highest expression in motherhood, and Kleist is inspired by the influence of that friend who helped, guided, reproved, comforted him in a true motherly fashion. This points us back to the fundamental principle that homosexuality is the result of an imperfectly sublimated mother-fixation.

It is at this point of the analysis that the history of Kleist's infancy and of his relation to his parents is most needed, and, unfortunately there are no facts at our command. If we be permitted to reason by analogy, and from result to cause, we may say that Kleist must have had the commonly found worship of his mother, and jealousy of his brothers, sisters, and father. We deduce this from his ideals of motherhood, from his homosexual friendships, and from his unreasonable jealousy of his fiancée. There is evidence also in his poetic works, though such must always be taken with a grain of salt, because it is so difficult to distinguish here between the products of the conscious and of the unconscious. His cherished dream of "a little hut in a valley," where he and his bride should live an idyllic life as peasants and tillers of the soil, is like the child's day dream of taking his darling mother away from all other troublesome encroachers, and having her all to himself in a fairy-like, simple, rosy, existence. On this rock his engagement was shattered, but it was for deeper underlying causes of which this was an overt expression—namely, that he could not surrender his heart to Wilhelmine as he should, that he could not adjust himself to the realities of life, and that he asked of her the impossible. He sought her not for herself, but as the half material embodiment of a dream—and the substance of that dream was his mother.

The most important substitute for his mother that he had in his whole life was his half-sister Ulrike, but even she did not give him the sympathy, the understanding, the self-abnegating love that he demanded, as his letters to her and to Wilhelmine show. She was not a whole mother to him.

Traces of the resentful attitude that we hypothesize as existing toward his father are found in the play "Der Zerbrochener Krug" in the rôle of the Judge, and in his "Prince of Hamburg," in that of the king.

We have noted the fact that any trial or disappointment in the life of Kleist was usually the occasion for a journey, and have seen that this journey was not only to satisfy his resistance against all the then-state of things, but also had deep-going psychosexual roots. Now the circumstances under which these journeys were taken, and his reactions to them give a key to the nature of this psychosexual root, which, it seems, is the unconscious desire to fulfill that old childhood's wish to go far away with mother, far from all troubling people and things—which, in childhood, means all disagreeable circumstances of family life—and to have her, and all her loving care, to himself. We find that he always chose a companion for his journeys; he never went alone. Furthermore, this companion was invariably a male friend whom he loved homosexually. Only one exception is found to this rule—the journey to Paris with Ulrike and this was not by choice but in fulfillment of an old promise, and the journey was not a happy one. As a third point in favor of our theory, the only journey that ever did leave him satisfied and happy was the one he took with Brockes—Brockes, who most fully satisfied his craving for "mothering." The end of every other journey, although it was taken with a well-loved friend, was a violent rupture, a flight on the part of the poet, and suicidal thoughts, sometimes threats, as a consequence of his disappointment. Whatever the ostensible cause of his despair the real underlying cause, all unconscious to himself, was his disappointment at not getting what he unconsciously sought, the satisfaction of motherly love and

cherishing. He sets out with a friend, in a seventh heaven of joy, but soon come reproaches for indifference, jealousy, quarrels, a rupture. This proceeding reminds one strongly of the relations between two supersensitive married people, such as Heinrich von Kleist's parents were. He but acted out with the chosen friend, to whom he had transferred his mother-love, what had been enacted before him in childhood. (There is no need of any such explanation, however. Many people coquette in this fashion whose parents never quarreled in their lives. A much more rational explanation is possible.)

The ambition of Kleist, seeming to us now extravagant and presumptuous indeed in its boast that it would "snatch the wreath from Goethe's brow," is an outgrowth of the ambivalent feeling toward his father, transferred afterward, by the widening spiral of spiritual growth, to other masters, elders, and superiors. This ambivalence—alternation of love and hate—shows in his affection toward Wieland the poet and Hindenburg the mathematician, whom he afterward hated, and in his rivalry with Goethe also. The boy wishes to imitate and then to excel his father, to be his equal first, then his master. But in Kleist's case an unattainable goal was set, and he was not one fitted to strive against odds. It has held true in the experience of Freud and his school that those who are aggressive in sex-life are aggressive in the pursuits of ambition also, while those who seek satisfaction in masturbation shrink from hard struggle in pursuit of an aim. Kleist felt his failure very bitterly. He never wrote anything of his great tragedy in finished form, and his inability to accomplish his purpose drove him to despair and suicide. Not this despair alone, but the despair also of finding satisfaction in any love, whether of his own or the other sex, filled the cup of bitterness to overflowing and made him seek refuge in death.

Whether his disease was hysteria or dementia praecox is a little hard to say as it presents features of both. The rising of unconscious thoughts to the surface, interrupting the current of conscious life, which is seen in both these maladies, is shown in Kleist by his extreme suggestibility, by his speaking to himself, between his teeth, and by fits of madness, in one of which he suddenly declared that he must throw a friend into the river in order to possess the friend's wife. When this friend, Adam Müller, came up he actually attempted to throw him in. As he had never evinced any passion for the lady in question, Sadger thinks that the Müllers were mere lay figures, substituting for the actual father that the child Heinrich, still alive in the unconscious mind of Heinrich von Kleist, would kill, and for the actual mother that he would possess. The substitution was the work of the Censor.

Another evidence of the uncontrollable Unconscious was his inability at times to distinguish between fact and fantasy. A notable instance is the account of a midnight feast in Paris, which he wrote of to his sister, and which never occurred. The analysis of this story reveals the hidden wish, and Kleist, like imaginative children, so realistically pictured the fulfillment of his wish that for him it became inseparable from reality. It is comparable to the hallucinations of the insane.

Of Kleist's later life it is needless to go into detailed account. He gave himself up to the care of his sister, himself a victim of hypochondria. From this state the impending Franco-Prussian war aroused him. The need of his country—which always vicariates for

father and mother—enabled him to find an outlet for the pent-up desires without resorting to sickness. It was not patriotism that inspired him so much as hostility and resentment toward the enemy, not love, that is, but hate of a powerful invader of his rights—a hostile father. After this he sought his release at last in death, and his suicide has more meaning in it than that of despair because of failure. It is really an erotic satisfaction. He had long nourished the fancy of dying, dying with a beloved person whom he could possess fully, in death. He never thought of dying *alone* and he condemned such suicide. When Henrietta Vogel consented to die with him he was satisfied at last, for he found in her at last the utterly self-abnegating love that he sought and never found, except in his mother. When she gave herself to him in death she was wholly his, as he could never hope she would be in life. So, to grasp at last the fulfillment of his life-long desire he took his own life, making a consistent closing to the unfolding of his restless spirit stirred always by the “divine discontent.” We cannot say that his suicide was that of an insane man, for it is no more insane, in itself, than the acts that many men commit every day in order to gain their most-desired end. Heinrich von Kleist could never live the conventional life because he could never reconcile himself to things as they are. An all-too-early fixation upon an unattainable goal was not broken down, and he pursued the unattainable till he fancied he found it in death.

IX

THE CASE OF GOGOL

By OTTO KAUS, *Schriften des Vereins für psychoanalytische Forschung*, No. 2, 1912, 81 p.

In this study the very interesting personality of one of Russia's great literary geniuses is treated with a sympathy and an understanding that no biographer or critic, perhaps, has given it hitherto. The poetic quality of the style in which Kaus has written goes far to increase the enthusiasm of the reader. These very facts of the presentation of the subject make it most difficult to give any adequate reproduction of the work without giving its eighty odd pages in full. In Gogol's life and character the salient points do not stand out so clearly to the layman's view as in Leonardo da Vinci's or Richard Wagner's, and it so happens that in order to make the analysis clear almost all the data and explanation brought up by the author (Kaus) are needed, and this mass of material cannot be presented in five hundred words. I am reduced therefore to giving a mere shadowy outline, a suggestive sketch, of the work in question, admitting that it is incomplete, and unjust to the original.

In Gogol's works there is a contradictory completeness and incompleteness, as if they presented the whole of existence, yet only in fragments, that suggests the incompleteness of Gogol's experience contrasting with his power to reproduce all the life that played itself out before his eyes. He was a realist who found his one satisfaction, his one avenue of self-expression, in the creations of his imagination. Yet though he lived through his fiction he could cast this fiction only in the mould of real life. (He was a true neurotic of the type that has a real antagonism to fanciful or artificial additions to a tale “because the actual happenings are so much more interesting”). Gogol must live in his pictures, with the compensation of realism for

their fictitiousness, because he was a failure in every department of active life that he tried. This failure may be due partly to a poor physical and mental inheritance but is undoubtedly largely conditioned also by childhood influences.

Gogol was for many years the only child. His father was an entirely insignificant writer of plays. His mother was apparently a negligible character. At any rate she plays small part in Gogol's inner life, and he never depicted a strong female character. The only child of parents to whom he could feel himself superior, he developed a life-long tendency to stand apart from others, to be different. In school, whither he went at the age of twelve, as in after life, he made himself different by failure, if success were impossible. He could not be a popular leader, therefore he would not be a follower; he made himself disliked. He could not win honors, so he dropped out of the game and played by himself. Here at school his first artistic impulse emerges, bred by his desire to assert himself in a way all his own. He wrote satires, and dramas in which he acted, with school-mates, holding up teachers to ridicule. In his attitude toward teachers and authorities, as in his early desire to draw, and to act plays, he betrays the familiar hostility to his father, whose inferiority to himself he would prove. In him the creative impulse was not a retreat from life, however, it was an attempt to find a bridge between his soul and life. He never ceased trying to touch hands with Life. The feeling of *Minderwertigkeit* never leaves him and he never ceases striving to disprove his inferiority. When his aggressive feelings were strongest he produced most. Failing as an actor he became a poet, recapitulating the experience of his school days. He failed also as a teacher and as a government clerk, but he succeeded gloriously as poet and novelist because in this field he could stand alone.

His paranoid traits, so clear in the madness of his closing years, are evident in many actions and attitudes of his life. He left his home in "Little Russia" and went up to Petrograd as a prophet and a Savior, almost as the boy Jesus went to his Father's house in Jerusalem. He was to save Russia, morally, and to glorify her. In all his relations to his motherland is seen the working of the father-complex, with its ambivalent content. It was long before he could free himself and go abroad, both in fact and in his fiction. His first works are *genre* pictures of Russia, his last, however, are Russian only in name. His last act of defiance was the burning of the second part of his last work, his greatest, "Dead Souls." He felt that in this second part he had failed, and he burned it, winning his victory, like many an over-sensitive soul, by refusing to fight.

In all of Gogol's works we may find his spiritual antagonisms and struggles embodied, from "Hans Küchelgarten," to "Dead Souls." His drama, the "Revisor," seems an epitome of the life of the world, played on the narrow stage of "Little Russia." Gogol's abnormal sensitiveness enables him to project and embody the warring impulses in himself in characters representative of humanity, while his very limitation, his weakness, gives him the power to take up accurately and reproduce faithfully life as it is, with the intense realism of the over-determined dream of a neurotic sufferer.

Lack of space makes it impossible for me to give even a part of the fine psychological analysis of the characters and motives of Gogol's works, and the sure tracing of these creations of imagination back to the events of Gogol's life, both the inner and the outer life.

One such motive that must be mentioned in addition to those already given is the struggle between the two sexual components in Gogol, the masculine and the feminine. Woman played little actual part in his life, from childhood on. He never had a successful love affair. One could almost be certain that his character predestined him to such incompleteness of experience. This absence of real experience had its counterpart in his soul-life, wherein the feminine quality struggled always with the masculine—and neither won a victory. His reaction to this struggle expressed itself in most of his works in the delineation of woman as evil, as repulsive, a malign creature. Even in the love plots the hero fights, as the culmination of his battles, *with* her, not *for* her. He fears her, and expresses his *Minderwertigkeit* in letting her be the conqueror. His failure to conquer woman, either actually or psychically, drove him to the "religious mania" described by his biographers. He became a mystic and sought salvation by fasting and self-denial. He had suffered all his life from a "complex" of the fear of death. Now at last he seeks to conquer both his fears, fear of the "ewige weibliches" and of Death, together, by seeking and defying the latter. He elects to die by fasting and he dies while kneeling before the picture of the Mother of God. "Groaning and crying out with his last strength, he had dragged himself to the symbol of the highest feminine completeness, and when he found the "Glorious Virgin" of his dreams his dissolution came. Did he seek a victory? a last surrender? Probably both together. He had overpowered Death and Woman, in that he gave himself to them."

So his closing scene is typical of the strength and the weakness that made the character and life of Gogol. The contrasting completeness and incompleteness of his work finds its counterpart in the comprehensive struggle of his life, where he met most often defeat, and never full victory. His failure to find the "pure form" which he sought, except in death, made him perhaps, a martyr. His difficulty in bridging the chasm between his solitary, child-like self, and the real world, made him a great creator of fiction, a practical failure, and a madman.

X

RICHARD WAGNER IN THE "FLYING DUTCHMAN"

By MAX GRAF, *Schriften* IX, 1911, 45 p., and

THE LOHENGGRIN SAGA

By OTTO RANK, *Schriften* XIII, 1911, 181 p.

Richard Wagner in the "Flying Dutchman." A contribution to the psychology of artistic creation, by Max Graf, 1911.

The life, the character, the work, and the genius of Richard Wagner are so far removed from the ordinary that it is not strange to find the psychologist and clinician yielding to the fascination of the study he offers and each trying to find the spring of the mystery by his own peculiar divining rod. Dr. Max Graf has brought the psychoanalyst's rod—the infantile complex—to the solution, and has given us a most interesting contribution to the understanding of Wagner's character from the starting point of his opera "The Flying Dutchman." This opera, the second of Wagner's works, is noted to be in sharp contrast to his first work, "Rienzi." Moreover, the themes that work themselves out in "The Flying Dutchman" are

repeated with variations in all the later operas. The principal one of these is the theme of the good and true woman contended for by two men, to one of whom she yields herself wholly, having, in some of the stories, seen him previously in dreams, and whom she saves from some impending doom by her faithful love. In the "Flying Dutchman" it is Senta, in "Tannhauser," Elizabeth, Brunhilde in the "Twilight of the Gods," Ysolde in "Tristan and Ysolde," and the theme enters partially into "The Master Singers of Nuremberg," comedy as it is, in Eva. One and all of these operas express a high ideal of womanhood, and of manhood as well, though the hero is represented oftener as struggling and falling. In the "Flying Dutchman" is found the theme in its greatest simplicity.

About a year before the first sketches of the Flying Dutchman were completed Wagner had made the voyage in a sailing vessel from Pillau to London, after his flight from Riga. He had previously read Heine's version of the Flying Dutchman's story but it was during this voyage that the story became impressed upon his mind, and that he obtained the setting and the atmosphere for his opera. The story relates that a Dutch captain is condemned to sail the seas forever, landing only once in every seven years, in order to search for the woman "faithful unto death" who alone has power to save him from his doom. He finds her in Senta, the daughter of a Norwegian merchant. Senta has already fallen in love with his portrait, which, handed down from her ancestors, hangs upon the wall of her home. Absorbed in fancies concerning the portrait, she is deaf to the wooing of her lover Erik and when the handsome original of the picture appears she yields her heart to him. They are betrothed, but before the wedding can take place the Flying Dutchman is impelled to set forth once more upon his endless voyage. He bids farewell to Senta, declaring that he will not involve her in his doom. She is determined to follow and share his fate, so when he embarks without her she throws herself over the cliff. As she sinks the phantom ship of the Dutchman sinks also, and the souls of the two lovers are seen floating upward. The spectators perceive that the Dutchman is released from his curse at last, by the power of the love of the Woman, "faithful unto death."

In this opera we have the expression of more than one trend of Wagner's character. The unrest and necessity to wander embodied in the Dutchman are paralleled by Wagner's own restless, troubled, wandering life. Finck, in his "Wagner and his Works," says "Wagner was born with the instinct of Travel." (Finck, p. 23.) That the phantasy shaped by his creative spirit is the attempt to satisfy his wild and unconquerable longings Wagner himself has testified. He writes to Liszt, in 1852:

"Of the real joy of life I know nothing; for me the enjoyments of life, of love, are only objects of imagination, not of experience. So my heart must enter into my brain and my life be only that of an artist; only as an artist can I live, in that is my whole being contained." (Graf, p. 45.) Again he writes,

"I cannot help knowing that if we had life we would have no need of art . . . art begins where life leaves off; when there is nothing more here, then we cry out, in art, 'I wished.' Is not our art merely a confession of impotence?"

If his own testimony be true then surely we may find in his strange, beautiful, and moving dramas the key to his artistic soul. We do not leave out of consideration the facts of his adult life, that

he was oppressed by poverty, harried by illness, that his domestic relations were not happy, and that he was embittered by the persecution of his enemies. But in order to probe the problem of his character to the bottom we must go back of these phenomena to the earlier influences that surrounded him.

A significant point in connection with his childhood is the ambiguity of his paternity. When he was six months old *Aktuarius* Friedrich Wagner, probably his father, died, leaving his widow with seven children. Ludwig Geyer aided the struggling family and nine months later married Frau Wagner. Richard was enrolled in school as Richard Geyer, and this has contributed to the confusion that has led some biographers to claim that Geyer was the father of Richard. Wagner himself in later life frequently spoke of Geyer as his father, and honored and loved him very deeply. Sometimes also, however, he calls him his Uncle. As he was his stepfather, and the only father he ever knew, none of this is surprising. Nevertheless it is not unlikely that he himself was uncertain of his paternity and that this gave rise to a complex—a complex that is by no means uncommon in children, who often fancy that they do not belong to their seeming parents. Richard loved the kind stepfather and would fain be his child; so, too, like other children, he would be differentiated from his older brothers and sisters. In later life he showed the influence of Ludwig Geyer in many ways, even to his manner of dress.

The other side of the infantile picture is his deep love for his mother. As a sickly child, and the youngest, he met with the over-tenderness that is found to lie at the basis of so many neurotic characters. He came to love his mother precociously, with the natural consequence that he wanted her all to himself, and would like to be everything to her, taking his father's place. The doubt of his paternity complicated this constellation further. Like the stepfather he is a rival, in his subconscious wish, to the real father. He would win his dear one, as Geyer did, in the face of an older rival, he would sweep all before him while the rival remains powerless. This situation is worked out in the triangle of almost all his operas subsequent to *Rienzi*,—in the Dutchman, Senta, and Erik; in Elizabeth, Tannhauser and Wolfram; in Brunhilde, Siegfried and Gunther; *Ysolde*, *Tristan* and *Mark*. There is much testimony as to Wagner's extraordinary devotion to his "dear little mother," both in his own writings and in that of contemporary biographers. Praeger writes, "I verily believe that Richard Wagner never loved anyone so deeply as his 'liebes Mutterchen'." (Finck, p. 12.) The conflict between mother-love and father-love, unconscious as it is, lends the tragic tone that impels to the creation of mysterious difficulties and dooms besetting and threatening the different dramatic heroes. Wagner identifies himself with Geyer, and later, as he has indirectly testified, with the heroic creations of his fancy, while his mother is the prototype of the gentle, tender, but dauntless Sentas, Elizabeths and Ysolds, who respond so quickly to the spell of the true lover and who maintain their faith unto death. The recurring theme comes out first in the "Flying Dutchman," as we have noted, which was begun soon after the disillusionment and disappointment of his first marriage had become manifest; it is more strikingly and completely worked out in "Siegfried," composed shortly after his mother's death. (p. 38.) Siegfried embodies his youthful ideal of himself as he would like to be in order to please his mother. All who know the opera will recollect the touching song in which Siegfried tells of his mother

Sieglinde. The description well fits Johanna Wagner, "of the wonderful eyes," as Praeger and others have pointed out. (Finck, p. 12-13.)

In the Meistersinger, furthermore, there is a mother-theme in Walther's story of his dream that almost amounts to documentary evidence that the mother-character underlies all the different shapes which Wagner gave to his noble, self-effacing, faithful, ideal of womanhood. This dream of Walther resembles a dream of Wagner's own, which he relates in a letter to Mathilde Wesendonk, in 1859. He saw two doves flying from her—Mathilde—toward him, while she holds aloft a huge laurel wreath. Then came a storm, with a blinding lightning flash, and he woke. This and other related dreams show with what hopes and wishes his personal life was filled and their resemblance to themes of his operas shows that the latter indeed served the purpose of wish-expression and vicarious fulfillment. It was after the disappointment of his first marriage, and with the effect of other disappointments and hardships also, that he was driven back into boyish dreams again, and in these he sought henceforth, through imagination and artistic expression of his imaginings, the satisfaction and joy of Life and Love that he never found in reality. Back to the shadowy satisfaction of dreams and fancies, away from the hard and bitter realities, back to the tender mother's breast, away from the unsympathetic world, as so many a genius and so many a madman has sought to go.

Is it the intensity of his longing, the depth of his disappointment and grief, that give to his music its wonderful emotional power, to his harmonies their strange, original, untrammelled tone-combinations, to his dramatic characters their lofty idealism, too high, almost, for mortals? Or is there some other condition for his genius? At any rate his own insight has given us the key to *one* spring of his power, at least. "Where life ends, art begins," he writes, and "When there is nothing more here then we cry out, in Art 'I wish.'" The Wish, by the law of Progression and Regression, is some form of the earliest and strongest wishes that stirred the childish soul, and that never die, although they change their shape. The less they receive satisfaction from life the more they tend to keep their original shape, to re-awaken in old, infantile, settings. So the Flying Dutchman fled back to the land in search of the one true, motherly, heart, and when he found her he entered at last into rest. So Richard Wagner strove to find his rest also in the refuge of motherly arms and boyish fantasy.

The Lohengrin Saga, by Otto Rank, 1911

This elaborate and very interesting study of the origins of the Lohengrin, or Swan-knight, myth belongs rather to the realm of the psychoanalytic study of mythology than to the study of genius. There is one portion of it, however, that has a direct bearing upon the character of Richard Wagner and upon his artistic motives. (Chapter VIII. Die Lohengrinsage.) This study confirms the findings of Graf as set forth in the preceding study and also adds one or two points.

The Lohengrin Saga is shown to be the product of primitive fancies and symbolisms, of common infantile conceptions and dreams, as has been shown in much of the psychoanalytic literature, notably Abraham's *Dream and Myth*, Rank's *Myths of the Birth of Heroes*, and Riklin's *Wish-fulfillment and Symbolism in Fairy-tales*. This myth,

like many others is a mosaic of race-dreams which makes its perennial appeal because of the answering chords it strikes in individual hearts. Wagner bears testimony to the strong hold that the story took upon his mind and heart and freely admits that the Swan-knight embodies many of his dearest dreams, and that in this creation of imagination he seeks self-expression. (p. 132.) He realizes that this hero, like most of his other characters, is egocentric, pointing back to the poet himself. His choice of the material for his opera was neither accidental nor determined by purely artistic motives; it came from an inner compulsion, because of the corresponding features in his own experience and in the saga. (cf. Jones' "Hamlet.") In a letter he writes to Rockel (p. 133) "The artist says in the characters created by him: So art thou, so feeblest and thinkest thou, and so wouldst thou act, if thou, free from the oppressing might of external life-impressions, couldst act according to the choice of thine own wish."

In Lohengrin especially he embodies the tragedy of genius, *his* genius, which seeks to realize itself in fullest humanity. "With his highest thoughts, with his wiser consciousness, wished Lohengrin nothing else than to become and be a complete, whole, warmly-feeling man, not a god—that is, to be an absolute artist." (p. 133.) It is "the longing out of the heights for the deeps," "out of the sunny splendor of stainless purity for the shadows of human love-embraces." "From this height the Woman drew my longing look," (Flying Dutchman, Tannhauser, etc.), the artist has written. When in his human relations the god-like hero finds darkness and shadow he goes back to his god-hood. Wagner wrote this after the unhappy turn of his first marriage. It was regression due to dissatisfaction, a process often illustrated in clinical study. Lohengrin went back to his mysterious abode when Elsa failed him, as Wagner retreats into the land of fancy. Again Wagner has written, significantly (Fünf Vorlsg. pp. 55-56): "All our wishes and so-called tendencies, which in truth bear us over into the future, we seek to build into tangible realities out of the shapes of the past, in order to win for them the form which the immediate Present cannot give them." This insight of his into the source of his creative work leads us directly to the search for the events of his past that were used by him in shaping his present and future soul-life.

Much of this has been given in the preceding summary of Graf's study. Dr. Rank calls attention, in addition, to the part played in the child Richard's mind by the doubt of his mother's truth involved in the doubt concerning his own paternity. Further, the second marriage disturbed his own possession of his mother just as the advent of a new brother would disturb it. In revenge he seeks, in his dramas, to portray women of extraordinary faithfulness, as embodying his ideal, yet significantly varying this in *Elsa* of the Lohengrin story. Further, in revenge he identifies himself with the father. His feelings find expression in his early work "The Wedding" and in almost every other, where the hero takes the heroine away from a former lover. So too we may mention that Wagner's sincerest attachment, apparently, was to Mathilde Wesendonk, the wife of a friend, and that his second marriage was to Cosima Liszt Bülow, the divorced wife of another friend. A variation of this theme is the winning of a daughter from a jealous father by *Siegfried*. Ambivalence toward the father is shown in the contrast character of the good Heinrich I and wicked Telramund.

Wagner changed the well known Lohengrin saga in one important particular—he had no true marriage take place, and therefore no fruit of the marriage between Elsa and Lohengrin. Since Elsa was an embodiment of his mother and Lohengrin of himself he could not bear the incestuous union. So, too, Lohengrin could not give his name (compare the Oedipus saga) for this exposure would parallel an exposure of incest. (p. 143.)

Wagner is the poet of Salvation—Erlösung. The Flying Dutchman, Tannhauser, Tristan, Parsifal, seek salvation, and with the salvation motif is woven the love-motif since salvation is found through a good, chaste, true, stainless woman, the woman who is the sublimation of his old childish naïve conception, in contrast to the new conception coming, not without a shock, during puberty. This contrast is pictured in Elizabeth and Venus, of "Tannhauser." Protection from all the unpleasantness and evil of the adult world is found in the return to the pure and holy Mother of childhood days. The Rettungs-phantasie, or deliverance myths, are birth fancies, expressing the wish to win the mother to wifehood, while the Salvation myths—Erlösungs-phantasie—represent the wish to be made a husband by the mother. It is the contrast of the active and passive. (p. 149.)

In Wagner's relations to his mother and father and to his wives we find, then, the emotional settings that account for his deep interest in the Lohengrin saga and for the principal themes that are embodied in his great dramatic creations.

XI

THE TURNING-POINT IN THE LIFE OF NAPOLEON I

By LUDWIG JEKELS, *Imago*, Vol. III, 4, 1914, p. 313-381

If any scientist could explain that man who has been hailed as "the greatest of the great," of whom Victor Hugo has said, "He possessed all, he was complete; he had in his brain human capacity to the sixth power"—if anyone could explain the supreme genius of *Napoleon*, he would render a service not only to History but to the whole group of sciences—Psychology, Sociology, Eugenics, etc.—that deal with the study of Man. To this problem the psychoanalyst brings his method, and, while he does not succeed in accounting for the overpowering greatness of the man, he has thrown a light upon some of his leading characteristics, upon one of the most significant periods of his life, and upon his over-mastering ambition and egotism. Napoleon's fatherly solicitude for his family and his people stands in sharp contrast to his relentless cruelty, his ruthless and Oriental despotism. His astonishing ambition seems paranoid in its boundless audacity, it would be almost ludicrous were it not tragic, yet he was a man of remarkably sound judgment and good sense both as a general and as a statesman.

Aside from these and other contradictions in character, to be treated later, his life falls into two contrasting chronological halves, in the second of which he holds views and sentiments that are exactly the reverse of those animating him in the first half. It was in or about his twenty-fourth year (1791-92) that the change came which is here called the turning point in his life. It was at this time that he changed from an ardent Corsican patriot, hater of France, and Anglo-maniac, to a patriotic Frenchman, and an enemy of England; from a condemner of Alexander the Great to his ardent admirer; he turned from a limitless reverence for Rousseau, to an attitude

of contempt, calling him a weakling and a fool; from a Jacobin, an advocate of equality, and an enemy of kings, to a general who loved to surround himself with full royal significance and state—as in his Italian campaign—and finally to an absolute Emperor, seeking equality, it seemed, with Divinity itself. (p. 340.)

We find, for the solution of the problem raised by these contradictions, much in Napoleon's own writings that will furnish the key to those able to grasp it. For example, in his Corsican period, he clothes his accusations against his father and against traitors of other times in such words as the following: "They have brought strangers against their *Mother-land*. . . . They have agreed to union with a stranger." (p. 340.) The concept of the land as a mother, and the hatred of strangers permeates his thought and action. The concept of Mother Earth is, of course, a very ancient one (see Greek and Roman myths, Livy, I, LXI, Otto Rank "Inzest-Motiv in Dichtung und Saga") and its universality shows to the psychoanalyst that it has a root in infantile psychology. Now if we suppose that Napoleon, like many other youths, suffered from an Oedipus-Complex, we find that his conception of the mother and the stranger, his ardent patriotism, and its sudden transference to another object, his ambition to possess the whole earth, and his assumption of despotic (paternal) power, will, with many phases of his private life, fall into place as natural consequences. It is true that we have no direct evidence for the existence of such a complex, and in assuming it we reason from effects to cause, but the effects do fit such a cause with admirable precision, so the explanation is offered as a more adequate one than any that has been put forth hitherto.

The facts, from this point of view, are as follows: Napoleon loved his mother, as a child, in an infantile sexual way and this mother-fixation persisted throughout his life. The complex so formed was further complicated by the circumstances of his father's absences from home and his mother's intimacy with the French governor (p. 340), Marbeuf,—the stranger. Corsica, his native land, became identified with his mother in the age-old, natural way, and France was the usurping stranger. The unconscious animus against the father strengthened the animus against the stranger also. Paoli, the great Corsican patriot, who led in the Corsican revolt against Genoa, but supported the union with France, was at first much loved and venerated. He was the ideal father, the protector of the mother. (p. 373.) The King of France was another surrogate-father—as all kings and rulers are "Fathers." The death of Napoleon's father initiated the change in sentiment, partially freeing the complex, liberating his own fatherly trends and turning him against Paoli. The death of Louis XVI of France completed it, logically proving, first that all fathers must be removed (as all sons know)—p. 370—and giving room, second, for his own succession to the paternal position.

Various phases of his private life show the workings of his complex. It is notorious that he loved women older than himself and women who were unfaithful, while he was brutal to the young and the virtuous woman. (p. 355.) Thus he sought the likeness of his mother in other women. As soon as his father died he assumed responsibility for his brothers and his mother, although he was not the eldest, and gave to all a true fatherly care that never failed throughout his life. When a boy at school in Brienne he fenced in a little garden spot, tended it devotedly and showed fierce outbursts of almost insane rage if a comrade dared to trespass upon it. Doubt-

less this garden spot was his symbol of mother-earth and he would not share his possession of it. His fiercest outburst happened upon the day dedicated to St. Louis and celebrated in honor of King Louis, in which celebration he sullenly refused to participate. This little incident has an obvious significance for the interpretation of Napoleon's life here set forth. As he was freed from the paternal dominations of various sorts his own paternal character expanded, and repeated indications of identification with his father occur. His pleasure in calling himself Charlemagne and in imitating that greatest French monarch may have been further stimulated by the unconscious identification of Charlemagne with *Charles Marie*, his father. In turning against Paoli he identifies himself with his father, who had done the same, at the same time carrying to completion the gradual liberation of the libido to be expressed by the unconscious cry "Down with Fathers!" In turning against Paoli he must turn also against Paoli's love for England (and he himself had been called an Anglo-maniac). (p. 373.) With the emancipation from paternal and monarchical rule comes the freedom to possess, and France also becomes a mother—and a far greater mother than Corsica. From now on the expansion proceeds, until it takes the whole earth, and perhaps the heavens as well, to satisfy his libido. Italy came after France—his mother was Italian, and he often wrote his name in the Italian form—then it took in Europe, and he had a frequently uttered eagerness to possess Asia and to be an Oriental monarch. (p. 377.) That astounding ambition that causes one half the world to heap his memory with execrations and the other half to surround it with expressions of admiration, took its rise, then, at the time when the extermination of two types of father resolved his conflict and left him free to seek the fulfillment of his wish in all its widest sublimations, in full possession of his mother—Mother Earth. The circumstances of the times were fully favorable to such ambition. The Revolutionary spirit sought to free itself from all traditions and restraints of authority, and to assert its Selfhood. So Napoleon identified himself with the spirit of his time, gave it its fullest expression, and then dominated it, as, after the revolt of young manhood against the restraints of the family, the maturing man seeks to rule, in his turn, a family of his own. Such a process is common, both in the private, sexual life, and in the wider life of work and social activity, which is regarded as a sublimation of the first.

Napoleon differed from other men in the intensity and degree of his complex, and, very probably, in innate dispositions that we cannot yet analyze. The times and circumstances of his life, the political situation, certainly had much to do with the momentousness of the results of his activity and also much to do with the paths that activity took. But he cannot be accounted for fully, according to our present knowledge, either by the world-situation during which he appeared, nor by the psychoanalytic explanation here offered. It is felt however, that the method of psychoanalysis has made a definite contribution to the understanding of the intense power and momentum of the man which carried him so far beyond the middle levels.

XII

THE CASE OF LOUIS BONAPARTE, KING OF HOLLAND

By ERNEST JONES, *Journ. Abnorm. Psychol.*, 1914, p. 289-301

A study of Louis Bonaparte is given here not because he was a great man—for assuredly he was not—but for the sake of the contribution that an investigation of his case can make to the understanding of the character of his marvelous brother. A psychological analysis of Napoleon Bonaparte could not be complete without a study of his family. If Napoleon shows what strength and power, what resistless force, may come from an unsatisfied and neurotic wish, which destroys the equilibrium of the personality, Louis shows how the same neurotic inheritance, working in a different manner, and upon different material, may produce the weakness of a paralyzed will.

Of his younger brother, Louis, Napoleon entertained the highest hopes, even thinking of making him his successor. He made Louis his favorite, personally taking charge of his education, and treating him with more than fatherly tenderness. Louis justified and repaid his brother's care and confidence with obedience and devoted service, up to his twentieth year, then he had an illness which was followed by a change of character and conduct. From this time he failed his brother repeatedly, refusing to obey his commands, acting in direct opposition to his wishes, or showing marked indifference and incompetence when he seemed to comply with Napoleon's orders. He made his ill health serve often as an excuse for his dereliction and indeed he was henceforth a confirmed nervous invalid. The climax came when he was made King of Holland, in 1806. He promptly conceived of himself as representing the individual interest of Holland rather than the large interests of the Empire and of France, and so put every obstacle in the way of Napoleon, finally precipitating the incorporation of Holland into the Empire and thus bringing one more nation into the coalition against Napoleon when the revolt came. After three years Louis abdicated and retired to Gratz, having failed his brother at every crisis. His conduct in the military campaigns in Egypt, Italy, and Russia, was of a piece with this. "During the whole of Napoleon's period of power Louis either refused to co-operate with him or else did so only very grudgingly and half heartedly. Yet there were occasional moments even in this time when his old devotion to his brother reasserted itself, particularly when the latter seemed in danger . . . and again . . . after his downfall." (p. 7.) In later life he busied himself with replies to his brother's detractors and firmly believed that Napoleon was the victim of persecution and that his every failure was due to the machinations of enemies. He never knew that his own conduct had not only wrecked his own career but thwarted the projects of Napoleon and changed the course of history. From the standpoint of the last named fact, an adequate explanation of his conduct becomes of value not merely for psychology but for history as well. The explanation can be found, the author believes, in the erotic relations of Louis to his brother.

That the affection of the brothers for each other was intense in early days there can be no doubt. Napoleon had much to say in praise of Louis' good qualities, while Josephine said of the latter, "He loves Bonaparte as a lover loves his mistress. The letters

he wrote to him when he left Egypt are so tender that they make tears come to one's eyes." Here is direct evidence of the truth that Louis' conduct leads us to suspect, namely that he had a strong homosexual attachment to his brother. Other evidence of his homosexuality is found in his very unhappy marital relations. Just at the date when Napoleon was arranging the divorce from Josephine Louis sought a separation from his wife. This may be a case of identification with his brother. His family life sheds much light upon the homosexual conflict, exhibiting his unreasoning jealousy, his doubts as to the legitimacy of his sons, and especially his suspicion of Napoleon in this connection.

Louis' relation to his brother is one of ambivalence, like the ambivalence of an adoring but rebellious son toward his father. Napoleon stood *in loco parentis* to Louis, and his attitude was just that of an over-fond but domineering and imperious parent. This aroused first a strong homosexual attachment, as Louis was of the feminine type and was attracted by his brother's masterfulness. But this state of feeling set up a conflict with his self-love that persisted throughout his life, resulting in the formation and permanent establishment of a love-and-hate complex. The venereal disease that attacked him was the immediate cause of the rise of the homosexual conflict. This experience had the effect of turning him away from heterosexuality and of producing a marked misogyny, as it has done in other men who are not strongly heterosexual to begin with, and as has notably been the case with Nietzsche. (p. 11.) His brother's treatment of him appeared to Louis as that of a firm but fond parent appears to an ignorant child, that is, as an alternation of love and hate. The fault did not lie in Napoleon, however, but in his brother's childish attitude. While Napoleon was in power jealousy and resentment caused Louis to withdraw from co-operation with him like a sulky, fearful, child, who both will and won't, and his ill health serves as an excuse—it is a protective mechanism against the truth, like so many hysterical maladies.

His case presents a paranoid syndrome of delusions of jealousy and persecution. As has been found in so many psychopathic cases, delusions of persecution are the expression of disappointed love, and are brought about by means of a double inversion of the underlying content. (p. 14.) The love is replaced by hate, and the emotion is ascribed to, or projected on to, the person toward whom it was originally directed. Recent investigations seem to prove that in paranoid cases the underlying conflict is always a homosexual one, so this is evidence also for the homosexuality of Louis. He never became a true paranoiac, however, but a nervous invalid, letting his physical organism bear the brunt of the struggle.

In his political attitude he duplicates the personal struggle, identifying himself with Holland and his brother with France. He was deluded for years into the belief that the Dutch people loved and honored him as their true sovereign, and longed for his return. Likewise, after his brother's downfall, France became a persecutor of his brother as his brother had once, so he fancied, persecuted him. The complex thus undergoes a transformation, when the brother's power is gone, but it is never resolved. Another reason for his later more favorable attitude toward Napoleon is the painfulness of certain domestic relations. He once believed Napoleon to be the father of one of his wife's children. In later life he could not accept this view and as an unconsciously adopted defence main-

tained that Napoleon had never been unfaithful to Josephine. His delusions however, were never so much delusions as *preconscious* beliefs, which his judgment was able to hold in check. He kept his reason, in the face of the fierce conflict of love and hate, at the cost of his health and his will to act, like so many neuropathic cases in our hospitals and sanitoriums to-day. Such conflicts exhaust the energy of the sufferer, leaving none for will and action.

XIII

AMENHOTEP IV. ECHNATON. PSYCHOANALYTIC CONTRIBUTION TO THE
UNDERSTANDING OF HIS PERSONALITY AND OF THE MONO-
THEISTIC ATON-CULT

By KARL ABRAHAM, *Imago* I, 1912, pp. 334-360

This able study of personality has a peculiar interest in that it deals with a character out of ancient times, and, in spite of the remoteness of the civilization of Egypt in the year 1400 B. C., brings the king Amenhotep IV to us as a very real and human person. He is one, moreover, whose ideals more nearly approach the modern spirit than any to be found in ancient Egypt.

The material for the study was gathered from the finds at Tel el Amarna, in 1880, as they have been presented by Breasted, Weigall, Niebuhr, Sethe and Flinders Petrie, all noted Egyptologists. And so complete is the data available that Dr. Abraham has no need to fall back upon speculation. The study is founded upon unquestionable facts.

Amenhotep IV, of the 15th dynasty, called the "Heretic King," was the grandson of the great Amenhotep II who completed the work of establishing the world dominion of Egypt, begun by Thotmes III. His mother and grandmother were Asiatic Princesses, the mother being Queen Teje, a woman whose character exercised a most significant influence upon her son. As is so often the case with the descendants of a strong and active character, the son of the war-like conqueror, Amenhotep II, was a man who could barely hold his father's work together, though he also was of the active type, while the grandson was a man of the contemplative rather than of the active temperament—an idealist and a dreamer—and the later descendants were neurotics and weaklings. That is, the first generation, rather overpowered by the might of the parent, is hindered from full development and becomes a pale copy of the father. He enjoys the luxury and power created by his father's efforts to an extent detrimental to himself. The second generation is still further weakened, shows a tendency to over-refined intellectuality, rebels against the ways of his progenitors, and becomes a contemplative, inactive individual, who gives up real life for dreams. Thus it was with the Amenhoteps. The character of Amenhotep IV is clearly revealed to us in the principal acts of his life and reign to have been such as is fitted by the last description.

Like his father he married an Asiatic princess, and he was the first of the Pharaohs to be strictly monogamous. He loved his wife with a tenderness equalled only by that which he had lavished upon his mother. When his mother died he did not lay her beside his father, but beside the tomb prepared for himself. In very many ways he exhibited his resolution to fashion his life not according to the example of his father but to the soul of his mother. He

introduced new forms of art, following nature rather than tradition. He used new hieroglyphic symbols, notably abandoning the hawk-sign for *woman* and spelling the word syllabically. Most significant of all, he abandoned his father's religion, polytheism with *Amon* as the principal god, and propagated the religion of his mother, the worship of *Aton*, an Asiatic deity identified with the Greek Adonis. He identified Aton with the ancient Egyptian God Ra, thus avoiding the stigma of innovation, but he admitted no other gods, declaring for absolute monotheism. Moreover, Aton was a spiritual god, not represented by any anthropomorphic being nor by any living creature, but by the rays of the sun—not the sun itself. He was "father of all things," "from everlasting," universal, omnipotent, unrivalled, benevolent, a lover of peace.

Amenhotep did not content himself with his own change of belief. He vigorously rooted out the Amon-worship, struck out the name of Amon from inscriptions, erased his father's name from many, and changed his own name to Echnaton, "the chosen of Aton." Still further, he removed from his father's capital of Thebes, building a new capital called Achet-Aton, near the site of the old capital of the ancient kings—Memphis—to whom he now turned as to his true ancestors. They are substitutes for his immediate progenitors, of whom his spirit disapproved.

Later, he claimed *Aton* as his true father, not in the earthly, but in the spiritual sense; still, in a spirit that shows his secret wish to disclaim his real paternity. Boys of common rank fancy themselves the sons of kings, Echnaton, being the son of the greatest king on Earth, can assert his superiority to his father only by being the son of a god. Such fantasies (if fantasies they may be called) are generally found with a neurotic disposition. Evidence is not lacking that Echnaton showed neurotic traits. The history speaks of visions or trance-states, suggesting either hysteria or hystero-epilepsy. The face as we see it in the bust preserved shows a sensitiveness and over-refinement that often predisposes to the recoil from reality constituting a neurosis.

Turning quite away from the customs of his fathers this idealistic, dreaming, cloud-scaling, young king devoted all his thought and energy to establishing his monotheistic religion and to making moral reforms, with no care for the splendors of world-rule handed down to him by his predecessors. And not only did he bring forth a monotheism and a morality equalling that ascribed to Moses, but also he approached far more nearly to the Christian ideal of deity and of ethics than any pre-Christian teacher. Echnaton fashioned his Father-god somewhat in his own image,—a god of peace, kindness, and good-will. Here once more he shows his antagonism to his warrior fathers. No image was permitted to be made of his God, who, as a spiritual being was thus removed from all rivalry, made a universal, and not a national, god, thus asserting Echnaton's ambitions in a way entirely different from the ambition of world-rule that animated the former Amenhoteps. It is a case of transference and sublimation the most complete.

With all the zeal of the true reformer the young king, who reigned from his tenth to his twenty-eighth year, devoted himself to the work of extending the kingdom of Heaven—and lost his own. Too absorbed in his religious dreams, and in his tender family life—which also shows clearly the results of mother-fixation—to care for the safeguarding of his Asiatic possessions, he let one province after

another slip from his grasp. Overrun by hostile tribes his distant subjects appealed to him in vain for help. One by one they were snatched away or they revolted, and the great Empire that his grandfather had labored to build and that his father had zealously guarded, crumbled into ruin. Neither did his own work stand. His people had never really adopted monotheism—indeed they were not ready to ascend to his heights of spiritual vision. After his death they hastened to go back to the old ways. The powerful priests of Amon restored the worship of their deity, Echnaton's work was destroyed, his inscriptions erased—in short, a strong counter-reformation set in.

Down the long vista of thirty-four centuries, Amenhotep IV, or Echnaton, as he wished to be called, stands forth an appealing figure. Physical and mental constitution led to repression of his true self in the lifetime of his active tyrannical father, during the first ten years of life, and to a clinging, mentally and spiritually, to his idealistic mother, the foreign princess. When the time of his freedom came he could not assert himself in the action and turmoil of battle and conquest. He still dreamed dreams and saw visions for which that early and practical age had even less use than later ages. Yet so lofty were the visions and so powerful the personality of the dreamer that he stands as one of the world's religious geniuses, though he could never be what his time and place required—a ruling genius.

XIV

THE PIETY OF COUNT LUDWIG VON ZINZENDORF

By OSKAR PFISTER, 1910, *Schriften* VIII, 122 p.

Ludwig von Zinzendorf, leader of the Moravians in the eighteenth century, and by some German historians ranked next to Luther as a leader, furnishes an example of a pathologically determined genius working in the realm of religion rather than of art, or of politics. He was the son of a strictly pietistic family and his upbringing was such that he could not have escaped pietism—unless his infantile experience had been of the sort that predisposes to revolt, and his was not. Neither could he develop into a normal personality under the conditions imposed upon his childhood.

His father died when Ludwig was but six weeks old. His death-day was observed yearly afterward and this made a strong impression upon the child, causing him to associate Death with Father in a way very significant for his later mental development, as we shall see. The teachings of his mother led him to bring into this complex also a strong interest in the crucified Savior. His infantile piety was guided to worship of Jesus. At the same time his stern mother showed him little tenderness and early sent him from her side, to school. At his pietistic school he was subjected to the severest discipline "for his soul's good," and was maltreated by fellow pupils as well as by teachers. Separated from father, mother, brother and sisters, he could not make the natural sublimations of his libido upon them. He found no substitutes for them and his whole store of love and longing was poured out upon the one whom he was taught most to honor—Jesus. Even in childhood we find him having ecstasies over the contemplation of the bleeding Savior. (p. 8.) And even thus early his feeling toward the Savior clearly shows its fleshly, or sexual, nature. How could it be otherwise when he was denied all natural

outlets and forced to "give his heart wholly to Jesus?" He carried out this command far more literally than most Christians do—or should, of course. The expression of his sexual desire became fetichistic, fixing upon the wounds and blood of the Savior. This was on the one hand allied with a necrophilism arising from the aforementioned complex of associations with Death, Father, and Jesus, and was on the other hand determined by the asceticism and repression of his training, in that the sexual complex, being imperfectly sublimated, sought objects as like to the original objects of sexual passion as might be. His theology, his rituals, his catechism, his hymns, show this with a clearness that cannot be gainsaid. It scarcely needs a psychoanalyst to point it out. Through contemplation of the wounds of the Savior he experienced love-ecstasies, even orgasms. The hollow made by the spear wound in the side became the centre of a mass of symbolistic interpretation, and the central point also of the creed and theology of Zinzendorf and his followers. It was the Cleft in the Rock, in which believers were hidden, it was the womb from which believers were born as Eve was taken from the side of Adam. This is the imagery of infantile sexuality. (p. 25.)

Carrying the religious expression of his sexual impulse still further he calls Jesus the Bridegroom and himself the Bride. Jesus is thus bisexualized, being at once mother and husband. In the period of his life called the Eruption period, from his forty-first to his forty-ninth year, the sexual fixation upon Jesus was greatly intensified, and the religious rites prescribed for his followers became religious orgies. During this period he addresses Jesus as a woman would her lover. He calls himself the Rib of Jesus, born from the wound in the side. He gives to the Savior's wounds the credit for the new birth of the Christian, and he henceforth looks upon Jesus as the creator of the world. God the Father is wholly subordinated and becomes a sort of Grandfather—Zinzendorf's own words—while Jesus is the Father. The Holy Spirit is now conceived as the Mother of the Trinity. Everything in daily life becomes a symbol of Christ's blood and wounds. The earthly marriage is but a symbol of mystic marriage with Jesus and should be used as such. Earthly love must be sublimated into spiritual love to Jesus. Zinzendorf's young son wrote at this time, and it is corroborated by others, that "we hear nothing but wounds and *wounds*, and *wounds*, and *wounds* and *wounds*, every hour." (p. 32, 33.) It is at this time that the infantile sexual character of Zinzendorf's religious thought ran to the extravagant use of diminutives that brought ridicule upon the Moravian Society. He talked of the "Little Side Hollow," of "woundlets," of the "Birdlings of the air of the cross," of the "wound-beetles"—believers who feed on Jesus' blood as bees upon honey—and even of little wound-fishes—believers swimming in His blood—a whole menagerie. The dead body of Jesus is exalted, its lifelessness satisfying the requirement for purity. He has intense sexual desire for the corpse of Jesus (necrophilism). He composes a Wound litany which is a religious orgy, sickening to the sane reader. He differs from others of the religious Blood Cult, in that for him the sacred blood is not for cleansing, but to be *fed* upon. So the Lord's Supper, the love-feast, the foot washing, all prominent institutions of his followers, show their sexual import very clearly. The love of Jesus with Zinzendorf had nothing to do with the ethical character of Jesus. No, the Savior was the object of a grossly sensual, erotic desire. The sensual side of the sexual object completely overwhelmed the ethical

being. The love of Jesus has always been used by Christians as a prophylactic for sexual love, but with Zinzendorf it is not prophylactic, not sublimated—it is sexual love, and homosexual love.

Zinzendorf's relations with his wife were cold and formal. During the period from 1741 to 1749 he met Anna Nitschmann whom he afterward married. There is no doubt that he loved her but he concealed his love even from himself, by making it a symbol of his love for the Savior. She shared in his obsession for the Wounds, which his first wife, judging from her writings, never did. His relations with her during this period probably contributed to the intensifying of the sexual fixation upon the wounded Savior, since his attraction toward her necessitated a very strong repression of natural instinct. He was unable to get away from sexual expression of a somewhat literal sort and so he sexualized religion until his version of Christianity bore very small resemblance to that originally taught by the Bible.

After the Eruption period there is some toning down of the excesses of the Society. The brotherhood was falling into disrepute, and upon representations by one of the brethren—von Peistel—being made to him, Zinzendorf forbade the use of diminutives with sacred words, suspended the love feasts, and gave strict orders about the association of the sexes in religious ceremonies. His inner attitude is not changed, however, although he expresses it less ardently and extravagantly. He still rhapsodizes over wounds and the hollow in the side, though he uses no diminutives. Meanwhile (1756) his wife died and he married Anna Nitschmann. This permitted him a more direct satisfaction and tended to modify the religious extravagance, although the libidinous trend was too firmly fixed to be completely transformed. The infantile determinants remained unchanged. It was probably an infantile fantasy about the deriving of woman from a rib of Adam—a fantasy common in children—that shaped much of his religious thought about the One whom he had chosen for the object of all his love. The childish association of Death with father and with Jesus was another influence, as we have seen. These infantile complexes, never given a fair opportunity to develop into natural sublimations, and the boy being driven, beaten, back upon himself all through his harsh childhood, with only the thought of the Savior for comfort, led almost inevitably to the form of religious fanaticism that we have seen. The intensity and singleness of purpose, the fanatical devotion, that arise from the same circumstances, make him a leader of others. He scarcely ranks as a genius, perhaps, yet he was most significant for the religious life of his time.

In removing Zinzendorf from the pedestal on which some have placed him let no one think that the author would belittle religion. Zinzendorf took the very lowest components that enter into religious life and made them supreme, conforming religious doctrine and practice to his own polymorphous perversities, satisfying his ambivalent sexuality, his sadism and masochism. By such an analysis as this we need not fear that Christianity will suffer. Religion that is founded upon Truth can only gain by separation of the gold from the dross.

XV

THE HYSTERIA AND MYSTICISM OF MARGARETA EBNER

By OSKAR PFISTER, *Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse*, Vol. I, 1911, pp. 468-486

Margareta Ebner, a mystic and nun of the fourteenth century (1291-1351) who has left us her autobiography, was a clear case of hysteria combined with religious mysticism. Her physical symptoms of hysteria included lameness, partial paralysis, inability to rise, inability to lower the head, headaches, toothaches, contraction of the jaw, pains under the heart causing spasms in which it took three nuns to hold her, alternating chills and heats, feelings as of having the head pierced through and broken, of having the limbs broken and twisted in death agonies, and sharp pains in the heart, the hands, and the feet. All of these were, according to her own account, simultaneous with or closely following religious exercises and experiences of a definite character. Mental symptoms were periodical inability to speak, causing sometimes pain and sometimes joy, fits of laughing and weeping, especially in the choir, hallucinations of taste—sweet—and of hearing, distaste for meat, and, after 1334, cessation of desire for any food, hallucinations, or dream-experiences, of being embraced by God and kissed by the Christ child, dreams and visions of Heaven, of the body of the Lord, of the Christ child, hallucinatory conversations with the Child Jesus, and amnesia at times for her Pater Noster.

She possessed a crucifix that she often pressed to her heart with all her strength, "almost dying with the sweetness of it." She wore on her bosom a small open book with the picture of the Crucified One just over her heart and slept upon it at night. She often stole (!) a large crucifix from the Choir and laid herself upon it, with her heart upon the heart of the carved figure, "And there I lay, pressed upon it," she writes in her autobiography, "till I slept in great peace." Once she wanted to get at a still larger crucifix in the Choir but it hung too high for her. Then in sleep, she saw herself stand before the figure, saw the Savior climb down and allow her to kiss his open heart and drink his blood "whereby she experienced the most intense sweetness." She held long conversations with the Christ child, wherein she inquired if it were true that his mother suffered no pain in bearing him, and like questions. She developed a fetishism for certain parts of the Savior's body, notably the heart and the breast. She experienced the greatest sweetness and joy in repeating His name; thus the name became a surrogate for Himself, to whom her piety was an erotic relation, on one side conjugal, on the other side motherly. With these ecstasies she also experienced great bodily pain, and always suffered severe pains in reading the story of the passion. She looked upon Jesus as her spouse—as nuns must, but she did so in a more realistic sense—and felt all the joys of union. As a reward for her piety she had the assurance—by hallucinatory voices—that Jesus looked upon her as his true spouse, his well-beloved, and his dwelling-place. Her death wish, shared by most mystics, is bound up with her desire to live in true inward union with her heavenly beloved.

Her motherly feeling is brought out in much of her writings about her communion with the infant Jesus, whom she treats as her own child. She prays "her child to wake her from sleep and let her nurse him." She is much occupied with the Circumcision of Jesus

and declares "for the sweet circumcision have I great joy." In all her extravagances and her sufferings, however, Margareta was not so extreme as many of the devotees of her time. She practiced no active self-torture, though she suffered the extreme of passively inflicted self-torture. She lived with the utmost austerity and asceticism.

For a psychoanalysis of her life we lack any knowledge of infantile sexual fantasies, such as we expect to find in hysteric patients, we lack knowledge of constant childhood repression and of acute traumata. Nevertheless, the close relation between her hysteria and piety stands out clearly.

Her astasia-abasia always comes at prayer time and is closely analogous to experiences accompanying social life. Her headache and toothache were experienced when reading the Passion story and are clearly connected with the Crown of Thorns and the smiting of Jesus upon the mouth. Her inability at times to lower her head connects with the death of Jesus when he "bowed his head and gave up his Spirit." The pain in the heart likewise reproduces the spear thrust. The occasional aphasia was connected with the dumbness of Zacharias and with Christ's cry, "My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" The sensation of floating in the air is an identification with Christ in His ascension, and connects with dreams when there is an upstreaming of sexual feeling. The heavy pains under the heart, causing such spasms that she must be held are due to fancies of motherhood, and birth pains. She was often unable to speak from vespers in the mid-week till daybreak on Sunday. This apparently connects with the interval in which Christ lay in the tomb, though why it begins on Wednesday instead of on Friday is not clear. A complete sympathetic identification with her beloved heavenly bridegroom is clearly evidenced however, by the symptoms given, and others that there is not space to mention. The frequent tastes in the mouth are infantile expressions of sexual pleasure. The anguish almost invariably following is masochistic.

Her desire for the crucifix is analogous to the desires of Zinzendorf treated in the foregoing study. Like Zinzendorf she betrays homosexual traits, for she attributes womanly characters to Jesus.

From this study and that made of Zinzendorf we reach the conclusion that the religious erotic does not really sublimate, but simply abates sexual desires. With them the battle of sexual desire is fought in the air. "In place of a transformation of the libido into ethical, productive, social, and cultural activities," writes Pfister, "a mere *elevation* is brought about, for which the honorable name of sublimation is much too good." The object of the hysterical symptoms and of the piety alike is to give the maximal intensity of emotion. There is a curious emotional *polarization* shown in alternating sadism and masochism, in misery and "sweetness," silence and compulsion to speak, weeping, and laughing, etc., that serves this purpose of intensification, in that the impulse being held back, and kept in check by its opposite, for a time, bursts through with abnormal force and gives the high tide of emotion that is needed to gratify the hysteric—who desires to experience pain as much as pleasure. The symptoms of illness are a part of this mechanism, designed to gratify the egotistical craving for feeling. Another cause for the physical suffering of Margareta was, as we have seen, her perfect sympathetic identification with her Heavenly Lord.

Margareta, Zinzendorf, and countless others, exemplify the truth that the Libido can pass over into Religion without transformation,

and when it does so, the polymorphous sex components break forth in wild anarchy. Thus abused Nature grimly revenges herself.

XVI

IGNATIUS LOYOLA, FROM EROTIC TO SAINT

By GEORG LOMER, Leipsic, 1913, 187 pp.

This monograph is a historical pathographical study of the founder of the Society of Jesus. The historical material occupies more space than the psychoanalysis, and the latter is not a *psychoanalysis* in the strict Freudian sense. It is not published under the auspices of any psychoanalytic organization, but it offers some material nevertheless, that should be considered in a survey of the literature of psychoanalysis on great men.

Lomer shows that Loyola was, first of all, the product of his race, country and age. "Spaniard and nobleman through and through, Soldier to the kernel of his being," he writes in concluding the study, "full of burning ambition . . . half an idealistic, active, northerner, half an emotional, authority-accepting, southerner." In the second place it was the accident of the wound that crippled him for life that turned the energy normally spent upon war and sex-conquest into religious channels. The force of these energies, suddenly dammed up and diverted into a partially satisfactory new channel, brought about the hysterical disposition that is clearly enough indicated in Loyola's mysticism, asceticism, visions and hallucinations, and the outbreaks of tearful emotion when in religious ecstasies. These ecstasies were surrogates for sexual satisfaction, as in so many religious mystics and fanatics.

It is this combination of overwhelming hysterical emotionalism with the clear cold intellect that made him an organizing genius, that explains the power of Ignatius Loyola and his Society. His exercises, which embody his spirit and genius, play wholly upon the emotions and through them seize and bind the will and the intellect. Loyola had, himself, the hysteric's power to direct and use his emotions to an end, and this explains his genius and his achievement. He was not a religious paranoiac and not a congenital hysteric; his hysteria was acquired in young manhood, and hence he ruled the hysterical manifestations, making them appear and disappear at will. (This does not imply simulation.) Moreover, he was able to impart to others this same power to call forth and use emotion, through his "Exercises." With his thoroughly Spanish character, which bears the masculine traits of bellicosity, fanaticism, intolerance, love of liberty, or, rather, impatience of restraint from without, and the one feminine trait of mysticism, perverted by the onset of hysteria, a personality was formed that could build and set in motion the greatest religious and political machine of history. Had it not been for the accident that deprived him of physical strength he would never, thinks Lomer, have turned to religion as a field for his ambition. His energy might then have been diverted into more numerous channels, of war, pleasure, and normal life, and have accomplished nothing notable anywhere. This point of the analysis is in accord with the view of the psychoanalysts that the achievements of genius are due to a limitation or frustration of natural activity and that the thwarted energy turns to creative work of some sort, in its irrepressible desire for self-expression and imposition of its own power upon the environ-

ing world. Such repression and consequent upsurging of energy has always a powerful emotional accompaniment, to say the least, whatever the relations of emotion and energy really are.

XVII

SCHOPENHAUER. ATTEMPT AT PSYCHOANALYSIS OF THE PHILOSOPHER

By EDWARD HITSCHMANN, *Imago* II., 1913, 100-174

Under this modest title Dr. Hitschmann has given a convincing and complete explanation of the character and philosophy of Schopenhauer, along psychoanalytical lines. I am inclined to think it unsurpassed in excellence by any of the psychoanalyses of great men yet presented. In the following pages I shall try to give the leading points of Hitschmann's analysis, without comment.

Every child, says Hitschmann, is, at a certain age, a philosopher; that is, he seeks to learn, first, the origin of himself and of his brothers and sisters, then, later, the origin of all life. This trait, like other infantile traits, may, under conditions favoring abnormal development, persist and intensify in later life, profoundly influencing the personality, developing, as it does, into the speculative temperament. An examination of all philosophical systems would show that they are traceable in part to the temperament of their founders. Schopenhauer forms a peculiarly brilliant example illustrative of this truth as the threads of connection in his case are clearly visible even to the untrained eye.

Heredity and home-environment both predisposed our philosopher to an unusual line of development, to nervous instability. Father and grandfather were extremely active and capable men but high tempered, harsh, and overbearing. The father is supposed to have committed suicide. The mother married for advantage, after an unfortunate love affair, and seems to have been unemotional, cold, and selfish. Both parents were inclined to nomadism. The boy's relations with neither parent were happy. He and his mother could not live together. She cared more for the society of her friends than for her son, was disgusted with his morose ways and unwilling to yield to his wishes.

He held her responsible for his father's suicide and resented her intimate friendships with other men. He grew to hate her, and hence to hate all woman kind; and this hate was stronger, as always, because it followed a repressed love, over-strong, because of his over-strong emotional and sexual nature. The complex formed by love for the mother with its ambivalent turning to hate, was stimulated and developed by the sternness of his father, of which he has written with bitterness, in later life. From these two elements of his infantile complex—the Oedipus complex—we may trace his misanthropy, his belief that the world was made by a devil—the feared and hated father—rather than by a God, and his conception of Will—again the father—as the dominant force of the Universe. From this protean complex, again, developed the fears that tormented his whole life, numerous various, exaggerated fears, of disease, of infection, of thieves, of prosecution at law, of death, of being buried alive when only apparently dead—fears that led him to constant watchfulness and precaution, and had much to do with his pessimistic outlook. His dreams dealt much with death and fear of death. He even has the fear of the unknown, saying (*Natur Philosophie* 658) that when he has nothing

to fear then he fears the unknown horror that yet remains hidden from him but surely lies in wait. All these fears developed from, or are residues of, *pavor nocturnus* in childhood, and these night fears of children are, as the psychoanalytical school of medicine has shown, very closely related to the child's sexual life. The sense of guilt, death-wishes and love-wishes toward members of his family, became converted into fears for himself by a mechanism of the "guilty conscience" seen often enough in the adult, only here it is a *guilty sub-conscious*.

Schopenhauer's own writings give us a fairly complete picture of his emotional life from childhood up, so that we do not here rest anything upon speculation. He speaks of his intense sexual feelings in childhood and youth, and rejoices when, in maturer years, the conflicts of passion are finally stilled. His treatment of the sex theme in his philosophy reveals the importance it had for him, both by the extent of the treatment he gives it, and more, by his contempt for the female and his homosexual admiration for the beauty of his own sex, his passivity in social relations, his seclusiveness and self-centered pride, all of which kept him from friendships of any sort until, in old age, softened by success and popularity, he grew more genial. The withdrawal of the sensitive child, wounded in his self-esteem by the sternness of the one parent and the lack of tenderness of the other, persisted into a withdrawal from the whole unappreciative social world.

Having endeavored briefly to indicate, rather than fully to describe, the process by which Schopenhauer's temperament grew out of his infantile emotional life, we go on to the principal points of philosophy and trace their nature to the same source.

Schopenhauer's one undying service to philosophy is his discovery of Will as a thing-in-itself. Will, according to his teaching, is the one, metaphysical, imperishable force in humanity, a blind, unconscious force, a force not in humanity alone but in the external world as well, a force described best as the *Will to Live*. This will is most characteristically expressed in the sex-instinct, at the philosopher's neglect of which Schopenhauer marvels. "It is not, like other wishes, a matter of taste . . . for it is the wish of which the very essence of humanity is made." "It is a motive so strong as to be always certain of Victory." (The World as Will and Idea p. 602.) "Sexual union is the true goal of all man's desires." The shame and secrecy of the act are accounted for by the very fact that it expresses the will to live—and life is a painful, a horrible, an evil, thing. To the impression of a powerful, domineering, tyrannical parent who imposed his will upon the helpless child we trace the concept of the blind, unconscious, will. To the precocious sexuality of the child, with its consequent conflict and repression we ascribe his conception of the place of the reproductive instinct and his attitude toward it as shameful and unworthy, also, in part, his pessimistic, resentful, and scornful, attitude toward Life as it is. Scorn of his mother—source of his own life—issued in scorn of all life and of the source of all life. From this same source came his conception of the highest good as pure reason, will-less knowledge, for this means a dream of himself as freed from the dominion of both hateful parents. It was just after his father's death that he began to assert his own will and to write. (137.)

In dealing with Schopenhauer's Ethics we approach another side of the complex. His actual disposition, aggressive, angry, giving way

to violent expressions of scorn and hatred of his enemies, is in strange and significant contrast to his doctrine of sympathy and his exaltation of the ascetic ideal. Another seeming contradiction is his sympathy for animals, in view of his implacability toward his fellow men. But the ascetic ideal is merely the conscious expression of his subconscious feeling of guilt, issuing in a masochistic desire for the admixture of pleasure and pain found in doing penance, in self-denial and renunciation. As for the affection and sympathy shown toward animals, that is rather a commonplace compensation used by the hater of humanity as one solvent for his conflict.

Schopenhauer relates that in his seventeenth year he was strongly seized with that same misery over life that Buddha experienced in his youth. It seems significant that this feeling arose in its strength just after the death of Schopenhauer's father. It is an attempt at penance for the wrong he has mentally done to his father in his old, infantile attitude of jealousy and hatred, a compensation for the pleasure he secretly felt at the fulfillment of his wish to have his father out of the way.

We have already touched upon the source of his pessimism, but this point requires some further elaboration. This pessimistic philosophy was but the reflection of his own pain and woe. Much of his misery arose from his inability to adapt himself to the society in which he found himself. His revenge is taken in belittling and hating those from whom he failed to win recognition. The mechanism of resentment, from which Schopenhauer suffered, consists in this, that through disillusion, defeat, non-recognition, with their consequent feeling of inferiority, a sort of mental self-poisoning takes place, while the humiliated and disillusioned man represses into his unconscious soul his revengeful feelings and impulses, his hate, anger, and scorn, instead of subduing them. Life does not yield what was expected and he begins to feel himself lacking in ability, he suffers from a dark conviction of his own incompleteness. All those objects, powers, and virtues which are unattainable he begins to depreciate and undervalue. All this leads to a falsifying of the world-concept; not merely a conscious falsifying, but an unconscious as well, for the new, false, scale of values is carried over into the unconscious, beyond the reach of Reason. It was this mechanism that was responsible for Schopenhauer's philosophy of pessimism, the mechanism itself having been set off originally by the complex arising from his family constellation. The fleetingness and unreality of all things, as taught in his philosophy, borrowed from the Vedantists, is his compensation for the unbearable life as it is.

In earliest infancy he had met an intolerable situation. He must share his mother first with his father, then with a little sister who arrived while he, in his ninth year, was among strangers. Feelings of neglect, suspicion, jealousy, grew into actual hatred and scorn of his mother, and this emotional attitude was reinforced by the fantasies incident to puberty and by his mother's actual conduct. The complex extended to include all women, all rivals, all which crossed his will, all which failed to satisfy his ego. He has been compared to Hamlet and has compared himself to Oedipus. This is suggestive of an unconscious emotional bond among these three. Schopenhauer also revenged himself upon his father by a surrogate, through a rebellion against scholastic and religious authority, and against his Fatherland and Father city. For all good and pleasant things, moreover, he became, so to speak, color blind, because of the

poison generated in his own system by disillusion and guilt. Driven back upon himself he becomes self-engrossed, and the real world is for him, in truth, his own consciousness.

We have tried to show that every feature of the personality of a man, the characteristics of his individuality, his capacities, his vocation, his eccentricities are to be explained—if we leave out heredity and the effects of experience—by his instinctive orientation and his lot in very early days of childhood. That is to say, by the family constellation. We have also tried to show that the ground work of a philosophy is derived from the unconscious soul of its creator, and to uncover the mechanism by which a particular view of the cosmos is constructed from known unconscious components. Much of the knowledge necessary for such an attempt at analysis has been derived from the study of neurotic patients, for the components that enter into the neurotic make-up are almost precisely those that enter into the genius. The genius, however, has the gifts of energy and concentration enabling him to find self-fulfillment in work toward a definite end. Schopenhauer, as a child, had the instinct to question the Why and How of things, as all children have. This questioning tendency has a sexual origin. The sexual element becoming repressed, it finds an outlet, with him, in intellectual investigation. In a neurotic of feeble constitution it might have resulted in helpless doubt and inaction. In a normal development it is sublimated, with other childish instincts, in its proper place and relation to the development of the personality as a whole. If, as in Schopenhauer's case, there was an unusually strong sexual (sensual) tendency, the repression leads to a reactive preoccupation with the super-sensual, with Death and the Beyond. The energy of the sex-impulse turns to philosophical thought and reasoning. The philosophical systems of all philosophers are but the projections of their own personalities.

That Schopenhauer himself understood to a great degree the rôle played by the Unconscious is shown in many passages of his works. A few of those cited by Hitschmann are: On dreams, "Natur Philosophie," 145, 146; On sex, the whole "Metaphysik der Geschlechtsleben;" On the unconscious nature of creative thought, "Natur Philosophie," 630, 652.

The "Will" of Schopenhauer is the "Unconscious" of the Freudians, the "Folk Soul" of G. Stanley Hall, under another name.

XVIII

SOME OTHER STUDIES

Among the psychoanalytic writings of the last four years are found several fragments of analysis of genius, that is, analytic treatments of some phases of the character or the work of talented men, that are yet not complete enough to be classed as explanations of the artistic or executive qualities of their subjects.

Such are the studies of the childhood of Tolstoi and Fouqué, under the heading "Of the True Nature of the Child Mind" in the *Imago*, by Hug Hellmuth, Lorenz, Reik and others, an article on "Socrates in the Light of Modern Psychopathology," by Karpas, in the *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, September, 1915, and more extensive studies of two German dramatists, Theodore Hebbel and Arthur Schnitzler, two studies of the former by Sadger, one of the latter by Hans Sachs, one by Reik, and one by Carl Fortmüller on Schnitzler's *Tragikomödie*,

"Das Weite Land." This work may be worth summarizing briefly, as it is suggestive of work that might be done along this line.

Tolstoi's childhood is rich in material and his after life, his ideas, and work, are a field in which the psychoanalyst should surely be welcome. Family constellations abound in his childhood. Both parents died early. Every memory of his mother's voice and manner in later years made him thrill and palpitate. Because his parents did not sympathize with his extreme emotionality he thought them indifferent, and finally conceived the notion that he was a foundling whom they had taken for pity. It became a rapture to think himself miserable, made so not by guilt but by fate.

His reverence for his father was so great that he unconsciously resisted it throughout his life. His father was conceived as belonging to a world of higher beings, whose life was full of secrets. Doubt of his father's goodness led by unconscious paths to doubt of God, and longings for death. In the death fantasies resentment against his tutor, whom he found too severe, played a leading part. The fantasy culminated in dreams of floating away to heaven with his mother. At the age of eight he was obsessed with the idea of flying—as a result of the father-mother fantasies—tried it, came to grief, and thought of it no more. All this is suggestive for thinkers of the psychoanalytic school and fits in well with their theories. Ossip-Lourie, in his "Psychology of the Russian Novelists" takes a different view. He holds that Tolstoi's doubt was the perfectly normal reaction of an intelligent man to the absurdities of religion, and that it was his later "conversion" that was pathological, that the key to his mature life and thought is senile and religious mania, due to a weak constitution.

Hans Freimark, writing upon "Tolstoi as a Character," making, as his sub-title announces, a study on the ground of Tolstoi's writings (*Grenzfragen des Nerven- und Seelenlebens*, 1909), gives another view of Russia's philosopher. According to his view the main-spring of Tolstoi's character, paradoxical as it may seem, is Egoism. Because of his overpowering egoism he was irresistibly drawn to the simple life and unalterably opposed to Culture and the benefits of wealth. Because of this he felt that overwhelming sense of guilt that drove him back to religion and made humility and non-resistance the core of his religion. It was this that made him misjudge and condemn the church. It was to save his own son that he lived, ostensibly, for others. From his egoism came his over-mastering impulsion to be a teacher. This essential element was the same in his childhood, his youth, his old age. The changes in his life, apparently in his thought, were merely external. In new forms he expressed always the same spirit, there was no true "Conversion."

It was his supreme need of self-expression, of self assertion, of proving himself independent of all that was given him, that was forced upon him, that drove him back to the simple, back to poverty, back to the life of the ignorant peasant. He had everything that can be conferred upon man by fortune, wealth, education, friends, liberty. These left nothing for him to achieve, or so it seemed, so he swung to the other extreme, flung off the hateful burden, denied the worth of the gifts of fortune, and strove to make himself heard in the world without the aid of anything external. From this attitude springs that spiritual pride that leads him to praise humility and to exalt the principle of living for others, as these were the very

opposites of the principles to which his birth and advantages naturally disposed him.

In addition, Tolstoi was a materialist, and what was not material was incomprehensible to him. It was this materialism, as well as his egoistic independence, that made him turn to peasant-life, and away from the church. His worship of simplicity is greatly augmented by this materialistic trend of his mind. The mystic side of Christianity could not exist for him. He could understand immortality only as an extension of the personality by means of love to the neighbor, so that all existed together, all in one, and each in all. But he never makes himself clear on these subjects because he never had the courage to face the truth as it really presented itself to him, just as he once lacked the courage to commit suicide when that was the only logical outcome of his interpretation of life. He took refuge in the assertion that he felt the duty of living in order to serve others. The same weakness is shown in his compromise in giving up his property, for he gave it not to the poor but to his wife—and in his wavering attitude about sex, condemning all as impure and yet again exalting productivity. Such inconsistencies came from his extreme subjectivity. In his egoism he could never see the viewpoint of others, his world was but a projection of himself. He conceived the doctrine of non-resistance, because this expressed his own reaction to culture. Non-resistance is the opposite of all the commands that Culture (*Kultur*) lays upon us. He rebelled against all that Culture represents in order to assert his own individuality, and so his reaction carries him to the opposite pole of progress—to non-resistance. It is one more asseveration of the doctrine he adopted, "He that loseth his life, saveth his life." He laid down all in order to preserve his own ego, in order not to be submerged by things larger than himself.

Because he could never, safe-guarded by Fortune, know any external need, he had to create an internal need for himself, to set up an unattainable goal and to make compromises with life in order to reach it. Only in meeting need, in overcoming difficulties, can one assert oneself.

"The Childhood Memories of Baron de la Motte Fouqué" by Dr. Emil Lorenz, and "From the Life of Guy de Maupassant," by Dr. Th. Reik (in *Imago*, II, pp. 513-521) show the neurotic constitution of both these writers, with the usual father-mother constellation.

In Karpas' article on Socrates, above mentioned, the well-known eccentricities of his character, including his "inner voice" and his indifference to his family obligations, are connected with homosexuality, shown by his love for young boys, and a specific "mother-complex," shown by his turning away from his father's trade to an avocation which he compared to his mother's, in that he called it "moral midwifery" or bringing about the birth of ideas in others.

In his article on "The Unconscious and the Dreams of Hebbel," Sadger declares that Hebbel anticipated a great deal of the knowledge of the subconscious that psychologists have lately found out. In the diary and letters we find observations about the unconscious mind, and about spirits. "Spirits are but symbols of our wishes and fears." "Shakespeare had to create murderers in order not to be a murderer himself." "In great poets things push up out of the chaos of their own force." "The insane are nearer to the other world than we." These are some of his pregnant sentences. He knew much, also, of the nature of dreams and used this knowledge in his works. "All

dreams are perhaps only memories," and "when we sleep the god in us wakes" are among the writings in his diary. He well understood that dreams are wish fulfillments, and clearly saw the interdependence of dreams and poetry. Dreams of childhood in which he once more trembles before his father show his strong father-complex, and perhaps a consequent masochistic tendency. His writings abound in material that not only supports the Freudian teaching but that also is of great and lasting worth for the understanding of this poet's own genius.

In an article found in Volume I of *Internationale Zeitschrift für Ärztliche Psychoanalyse*, pp. 115-169, Sadger treats further of the neurotic features of Hebbel's case, and of their connection with sexuality. In a second article in Volume II of the *Imago* he takes up the work of Hebbel again, incidentally to a discussion of Pathography and Psychography. In this he analyzes Hebbel's drama, "Judith and Holofernes," and shows how the poet's conception of Judith as "neither a maid nor a wife, but a virgin widow," was traceable to his Oedipus complex. Judith, Hebbel declares, could never have done the deed had she been other than this—a woman married but widowed before she had known true marriage. The virgin's ignorance and the wife's experience would alike have been deterrent. This, pieced with facts of Hebbel's childhood, indicates to Sadger a mother-complex, part of which was the poet-child's inability to endure the thought of actual marital relations between his father and mother.

Carl Spitteler is another German poet hailed by the psychoanalytic school (Hans Sachs, *Imago* II, pp. 73-77), as one whose work supports Freud's conclusions as to the unconscious life. Sachs says, "His work is nothing less than a compendium for psychologists and neurologists." In a second article upon Spitteler, entitled "Homer's Youngest Descendant," appearing in *Imago*, 1914, Sachs tells us that Spitteler has given us the inner world as extensively and perfectly as Homer painted the external world. His works have given us the material that goes into the dreams of the average man—the life of a child, with the significant features evolved into powerful symbols, through which later experiences work.

The study of "Motive-formation in Schnitzler," by Hans Sachs, shows this dramatist's grasp of the principle of ambivalence, carrying the analysis through four or five of Schnitzler's works, and tracing the oscillation between love and hate in some of the characters in each.

In an article entitled "The Omnipotence of Thought in Schnitzler," by Dr. Theodore Reik, an article which is but an extract of a larger and uncompleted work on Schnitzler, it is shown that the author had a thorough knowledge of the mechanism of narcissism, or self-love, with its relation to the repression-neurosis developed in childhood, and the growth of the conception of the all-powerfulness of thought as a result of this neurosis and the narcissus-complex. It is the child, killing those who thwart his will in fancy, by the mere force of his wishes, who grows into the man with faith in the power of thought, of "mind over matter." Schnitzler's own infantile experience and subsequent conflicts must have taught him this.

No doubt Reik's larger work on "Schnitzler as a Psychologist" will take its place among the significant psychoanalytic studies of artistic genius.

Richard Adolf Hoffmann has made a study of Kant and Swedenborg (*Grenzfragen des Nerven- und Seelenlebens*, 1909), which is

of interest to the psychoanalyst because of the account of the abnormal traits of Swedenborg contained in the fourth part. It is shown that Swedenborg, in his later years, at least, was of a restless and nomadic temperament. He traveled constantly and seemed highly excitable at times. At other times he was in a trance-state, or a state of auto-hypnosis. He grew very ascetic, would eat no animal food, and was probably ill-nourished; moreover, he drank coffee constantly, and this might have affected his nervous balance. Whether there had ever been a sexual trauma it is difficult to know. Swedenborg was never married; he had, in youth, been betrothed to a young girl, but gave her up when he found that she did not love him. Some of his recorded dreams show sexual elements, as is to be expected. In his last years his speech was obstructed; he spoke very slowly and at times stuttered. All these traits suggest a partial dissociation of consciousness, or a very active *unconsciousness*, but that all of Swedenborg's spiritualistic experiences are explainable by this the author does not claim. He thinks that though Kant may have been right in calling Swedenborg a candidate for the hospital yet the latter was able, in his ecstatic state, to perceive truths that must escape ordinary men.

A study of genius by an American writer, which, having been published in America, in our English tongue, scarcely needs an introduction to American readers, is "A Study of the Epilepsy of Dostojewsky," by L. Pierce Clark, published in the *American Journal of Medical Science*, 1914. I can hardly forbear, nevertheless, giving it a place in these summaries of the psychoanalyses of genius, since it treats a new phase of the subject in an able and significant way. Dostojewsky was one of those brilliant men whose genius is clearly allied with a psychopathic disposition. Some critics, among them Ossip-Lourie (in "The Psychology of Russian Novelists"), declare that he is not really a genius, and that his books owe their appeal to his power of description of suffering, which he owed to his own suffering. Clark, who draws largely from Segaloff's work on Dostojewsky, shows how very clearly the epileptic character is shown in Dostojewsky's life and work, how his work is moulded from the experiences of epileptic attacks and their prodromal symptoms and after-effects, how the books abound in psychopathic characters, everyone drawn from the personal experience of this very subjective writer, and how the heights and depths of human feeling sounded in the novels are transcripts of the ecstasies and black depressions of the epileptic sufferer.

Alienists have marveled at Dostojewsky's expert knowledge of psychopathology, exact and comprehensive, which was drawn from self-study. Strakoff states that all which Dostojewsky wrote had been lived through by him with fervor and devotion. In order to rank among the greatest of a great school of novelists Dostojewsky had but to write down, with the circumstantiality of the epileptic character, his own psychic experiences.

Clark, in his personality study of the epileptic character (*American Journal of Medical Science*, Nov. 1914), has found that the epileptic attack is a libidinous satisfaction to the epileptic individual, and the libidinous strivings are simple and infantile. Many epileptics have a feeling of ecstasy before the attack, for which, to quote Dostojewsky's own words, "though it last but five seconds one would give ten years of life." In such an instant of ecstasy Mohammed, also an epileptic, visited paradise, and returned. As Dostojewsky

says, this was not a lie on Mohammed's part. Perhaps all our most widely known conceptions of heaven have been given us by epileptics. In these moments a peace, a harmony with all the world, an ineffable joy "that one could not bear longer and live" is felt. The anguish of the attack, the torpor following, and the deep depression, often accompanied by a feeling of guilt for a nameless, unknown, sin, are as deep as the ecstasy is high. All this Dostojewsky experienced, and showed as well the other epileptic symptoms of moodiness, deteriorating memory, fits of unreason, unsociability, and general intolerance. His book, "The Devil," written after the disease had begun to tell upon him shows these last named traits more clearly than the others. His memory had suffered so much by now that he could not remember what he had written and was obliged to read back; at the same time he hated the book and never re-read it after it was finished.

The causes for the formation of the epileptic constitution are as yet very imperfectly worked out. Dostojewsky had his first actual attack during his exile in Siberia. But before this he was neurasthenic, hypochondriac, and suffering from various physical disturbances of a psycho-genic nature. His childhood shows features likely to generate abnormal development. His fragile mother died when he was quite young, about the same time that Pushkin, whom he ardently admired, was killed in a duel. The boy suffered a great shock, and a loss of voice for several days, which was no doubt of psychogenic origin. His father was a military surgeon and a strict disciplinarian against whom the boy rebelled, as he rebelled against the discipline of the Engineering School later. That he was born with a psychopathic disposition there is no doubt, and there was little in his upbringing to correct this. He had throughout life the infantile type of mentality. "He reasoned or dated all things from his own inner consciousness. He was intensely egoistic, most of his reported conversations were but monologues on his part. He continued to develop his self-centered characteristics, failed to observe the conventions of society, did not recognize friends in his fits of abstraction, inconvenienced them by requiring their household arrangements to be changed to suit his own convenience." (Clark.)

He had childish tantrums and odd ways of defying the physician's prescriptions. Some time before his epilepsy developed his personality underwent further changes; he had fits of depression and anxiety, lethargic sleep after which he seemed to strive to continue his life in a dream. He also had periods of extreme irritability, embittered himself with governmental authority and suffered in lonely exile. It was after this revolt against the government (which to psychoanalysts is unconsciously a revolt against the father) that he lost his neurasthenic symptoms and became patient, tranquil, master of himself. (The writer has known similar sequences of events in other neuropathics. There is no doubt, at any rate, that a good fight in which one's own independence is asserted acts as a curative.) This means that the libido wins a freer range. How much of Dostojewsky's repression was permanently freed as he soon after developed epilepsy, another, and a pathological, method of self-emancipation, is a question.

Dostojewsky clearly perceived the infantile make-up of the epileptic mind as is shown in the portrayal of Count Mischkin in "The Client," and in "Nelly," and some of his other epileptic characters. His power of self-analysis, added to his suffering, his range of emo-

tional experience, his psychic detachment from the normal world are responsible, it seems, for his power as a novelist, and these qualities are part and parcel of the epileptic constitution. He is not the only great epileptic. There is something to be learned from a psychoanalytic study of Mohammed, of Caesar, of St. Paul. But no one has yet told us why some epileptics and some neurotics are geniuses while others are helpless sufferers or demented. There are guesses, to be sure, but no satisfactory explanation.